MINUTED OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Held in Washington D. C. - December 12, 1952

The fourth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, during the fiscal year 1953, was held in its Office in the Interior Department Building on Friday, December 12, 1952. The following members were present:

Mr. Finley, Chairman,
Prof. Hudnut,
Prof. Belluschi,
Mr. Peets,
Mr. de Weldon,
Mr. Biddle,

also Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

LETTER FROM MR. NEILD: Chairman Finley read a letter that he received from Mr. Edward F. Neild, reporting that his health is improving. The letter reads as follows:

> "I have your letter which I appreciate very much and would have written sooner but have been out of commission for the past ten weeks. However, I am recovering and expect to be in good shape again some day soon.
>
> "I have phoned my doctor this morning to ask if I might attend the next meeting of the Commission this month but have been advised not to do so. I hope that I can attend with more regularity after this month.
>
> "Please give my kindest regards to the other members and, with best regards to yourself, I am"

The Commission were much pleased to hear from Mr. Neild and to know that he is recovering from his illness.

RETURN OF MR. BIDDLE: The Commission welcomed the return of Mr. Biddle to the United States after the absence of a year as artist in residence at the American Academy in Rome.

GIFT OF SILVER BOWL TO THE SECRETARY: Chairman Finley said: "Before we start, we have another very pleasant duty to perform. The idea is entirely

Minutes of Meeting of the Committee of Five Acts

World Headquarters, D. C. – December 15, 1952

The fourth meeting of the Commission of Five Acts, during the fiscal year [illegible], was held in the Offices in the Interior Department Building on Friday, [illegible] December 19, 1952. The following members were present:

Mr. Finley, Chairman,
Prof. Kindred,
Prof. Sullivan,
Mr. Reese,
Mr. de Waldon,
Mr. Biddle,

also Mr. M. P. Cameron, Secretary and [illegible] administrative officer.

The meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m.

REPORT FROM Mr. FINLEY: Chairman Finley read a letter that he received from Mr. Edward F. Field, reporting that his health is improving. The letter was as follows:

"I have your letter which I appreciate very much, and would have written sooner but have been out of commission for the past [illegible] three weeks. However, I am recovering and expect to be in good shape again some day soon."

"I have phoned my doctor this morning to ask if I might attend the next meeting of the Commission this month but have been advised not to do so. I hope that I can attend with more regularity after this month."

"Please give my interest regards to the other members and with best regards to yourself, I am,"

The Commission was much pleased to hear from Mr. Field and to learn that he is recovering from his illness.

REPORT OF Mr. BIDDLE: The Commission received the report of Mr. Biddle on the United States after the absence of a year as orbital in relations of the [illegible] nation Academy in Rome.

[illegible] OF ITEMS FOR THE AGENDA: Chairman Finley said: "Unless we [illegible], we have another very pleasant duty to perform. The time is entirely

Mr. de Weldon's, and it is one that we all share. This year marks the thirtieth year of Mr. Caemmerer's service to the Fine Arts Commission as its Executive Secretary. I think he was with the Commission several years before that. For thirty years he has been doing this work in a most competent manner. Mr. de Weldon has very generously made it possible for the Commission of Fine Arts to present this bowl. It is engraved with the names of the members of the Commission, December 12, 1952, "In grateful recognition of his devoted service as Executive Secretary over a period of thirty years." It is a Paul Revere bowl."

Mr. Caemmerer thanked the Commission for this beautiful gift, and said: "I shall appreciate it the rest of my life. It has been a great honor to serve this Commission. During the past thirty years the Commission has accomplished very much to make the City of Washington a beautiful Capital City.

"I have not been any too well the past several months and my doctor advised me to go South during the holiday period. I am planning to fly to Puerto Rico tomorrow night and visit several of the islands of the West Indies."

The Commission granted the request for leave of absence.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Commission approved the Minutes of the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on October 22, 1952.

2. FOGGY BOTTOM DEVELOPMENT: In accordance with the request of the Commission of Fine Arts made at the meeting on October 22, 1952, the Secretary submitted the following report:

December 12, 1952

"MEMORANDUM FOR: The Commission of Fine Arts

At the October meeting of the Commission, I was asked to look into the matter of the proposed "multimillion-dollar residential and commercial development" planned for Foggy Bottom, in the vicinity of Virginia and New Hampshire Avenues, N. W. I have learned from the staff of the National Capital Planning Commission that that Commission has simply taken note of the project as proposed.

With regard to the question raised as to the extent the provisions of the Shipstead-Luce Act would be applicable, I wish to report that a large part of the tract, which comprises 10 acres, would front the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway. Under this provision of law, designe

for the proposed apartments would have to be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts by the Director of Inspection (Building Inspector) of the District of Columbia Government.

Sgd.
H. P. Caemmerer,
Secretary.

Since then, information has been obtained that this is to be a 50-million-dollar apartment project and that the promoters (a syndicate in New York) is anxious to know where the proposed bridge across the Potomac in this locality is to be built.

The Commission called attention to the fact that the suggestion to build a bridge from E. Street, Northwest, across Theodore Roosevelt Island was disapproved at a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held on March 28, 1952.

3. PROPOSED BRIDGE TO CROSS THE POTOMAC AT ALEXANDRIA: The Secretary stated: "Two sites have been suggested to cross the Potomac River at Alexandria-one at the north end of the city, and the other at the south end at a place called Jones' Point, where the first boundary stone was erected in 1791 to mark the District of Columbia.

"I live in Alexandria, Washington's home town, and some people there have asked me to help them secure a bridge at Jones' Point. The city is very much in need of it.

"An important factor in connection with this project is that a bridge at this location will make it possible to divert 10,000 trucks a day to go by way of this bridge and bypass Washington as they come by way of U. S. No. 1, which extends from Maine to Florida. Here on the Virginia side it will connect with the Shirley Highway and on the Maryland side with the Washington-Baltimore Parkway. We hope legislation for the bridge can be secured at the next session of Congress."

4. PERSONNEL OF THE NEWLY ORGANIZED NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION: The Secretary presented a memorandum (Exhibit A), giving the membership of the

for the proposed experiments would have to be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts by the Director of Inspection (Building Inspector) of the District of Columbia Government.

Sgd.
I. J. Geometer,
Secretary.

Since then, information has been obtained that this is to be a 30-million-dollar apartment project and that the promoters (a syndicate in New York) is anxious to know where the proposed bridge across the Potomac in this locality is to be built.

The Commission called attention to the fact that the suggestion to build bridge from K. Street, Northwest, across Theodore Roosevelt Island was disapproved at a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held on March 28, 1932.

3. PROPOSED BRIDGE TO CROSS TWO RIVERS AT ALEXANDRIA: The Secretary stated: "Two cities have been suggested to cross the Potomac River at Alexandria: one at the north end of the city, and the other at the south end at a place called 'Jones' Point', where the first boundary stone was erected in 1791 to mark the District of Columbia.

"I like to Alexandria, Washington's home town, and some people there have asked me to help them secure a bridge at 'Jones' Point'. The city is very much in need of it.

"An important factor in connection with this project is that a bridge at this location will make it possible to divert 10,000 circuits a day to go by way of this bridge and bypass Washington as they come by way of U. S. No. 1, which is extremely congested from Maine to Florida. Here on the Virginia side it will connect with the Shirley Highway and on the Maryland side with the Washington-Baltimore Parkway. We hope legislation for the bridge can be secured at the next session of Congress."

4. CONSIDERATION OF TENTATIVE COMMEMORATIVE COIN DESIGNS: The Secretary presented a memorandum (Exhibit A), giving the correspondence of the

newly appointed National Capital Planning Commission together with a list of the various committees. Also he called attention to the provision in the Act of Congress (approved July 19, 1952), creating a Regional Council which will have on it representatives from the States of Maryland and Virginia, as well as the District of Columbia. The Secretary pointed out that the National Capital Planning Commission will now function on a large scale such as the New York City, Chicago, and Detroit Planning Commissions.

Also, he said that Washington D. C., including its metropolitan area, now has a population of 1,500,000 and that the entire area, including the central area, comprises nine-hundred square miles, extending 15 miles in each direction of the Compass.

5. EXHIBITION SPACE FOR THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: The Secretary reported that the American Institute of Architects has offered, through Mr. Frederick Gutheim, Assistant to the Director, to be of service in making available to the National Capital Planning Commission, and the Commission of Fine Arts, the exhibition gallery which is adjacent to the Commission of Fine Arts Office, by vacating an agency that now has about 15 clerks in the gallery. The gallery is very much needed for the exhibition of models and designs that pertain to the development of the Plan of Washington.

The Commission expressed their appreciation of the help offered by the American Institute of Architects in this matter,

6. DOMICILIARY BUILDING, SOLDIERS' HOME: Colonel Alan J. McCutchen, District Engineer, Department of Defense, brought before the Commission a revised design for the proposed Domiciliary Building at the Soldiers' Home. He said: "This meeting this morning stems from an exchange of correspondence in June and July of 1951. In June, we made a presentation of the Domiciliary Building for the Soldiers' Home, which the Commission did not look upon with favor and asked that we attempt to modify the design for the building and also,

of the Compass.

Also, he said that Washington D. C., including its metropolitan area, now has a population of 1,500,000 and that the entire area, including the central area, comprises nine-hundred square miles, extending 15 miles in each direction

5. EXHIBITION SPACE FOR THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: The Secretary reported that the American Institute of Architects has offered, through Mr. Frederick Gutheim, Assistant to the Director, temporary service in making available to the National Capital Parks and the Commission of Fine Arts, the exhibition gallery which is adjacent to the Commission of Fine Arts Office, by vacating an agency that now has about 15 clerks in the gallery. The gallery is very much needed for the exhibition of models and designs that pertain to the development of the Plan of Washington.

The Commission expressed their appreciation of the help offered by the American Institute of Architects in this matter.

6. DOMICILIARY BUILDING, SOLDIERS' HOME: Colonel Allan D. McArthur, District Engineer, Department of Defense, brought before the Commission a revised design for the proposed Domiciliary Building at the Soldiers' Home. He said: "This meeting this morning stems from an exchange of correspondence in June and July of 1951. In June, we made a presentation of the Domiciliary Building for the Soldiers' Home, which the Commission did not look upon with favor and asked that we attempt to modify the design for the building and also, in our future master planning, open up the arrangement of the buildings so

that we preserve the park appearance and avoid an institutional atmosphere. We have attempted to do both of those things. So that we can visualize how the building has been modified, I have brought along first the perspective.

"In this perspective I have to remind you that the building that we were discussing at that time is this one (indicating). The principal objections of the Commission were this pyramid and the embellishments on the building. Here is a photograph of the building as it is being constructed to show that the pyramid has been removed and from the rear that the embellishments have also been removed, resulting in what we feel might be a more acceptable structure."

Professor Hudnut remarked, I do not think our objections were to the pyramid or the embellishments but the courts, filling them up with structures looking down on the roofs. In other words, what we thought was bad planning—— but the real objection was this conception of the building built around a court with a great room in the center.

Chairman Finley said, "Yes, we felt that the persons occupying the rooms would look down on nothing but roof tops instead of having some green trees, grass and the like to look upon."

Mr. Peets commented by saying, "That is true."

Professor Hudnut emphasized the fact that the design was not approved.

Colonel McCutchen replied, "That remains unapproved, but we would like to let the Commission know that we have complied as best we can and as we indicated in our letter of July 5th, as many other changes as possible will be made to accomplish the feeling of the Commission before construction on this building progresses beyond the economical limits for modifications.

There is one other piece of prior business. When we submitted the design originally for the hospital ward wing, that carried the mausoleum-type of entrance and the frieze which we did not care for, and the Commission suggested

changes; but we have never submitted a revised perspective. I thought that the Commission would be interested in a perspective showing the changes with it has suggested.

I wanted to show these this morning before we discussed the Master Plan so that we would have in mind a concept of what the buildings to be involved in the Master Plan would look like since those establish to some extent a pattern for the remaining buildings.

Chairman Finley asked if this building is under erection now, and Colonel McCutchen replied that it is.

Mr. Finley asked if there are any comments, and Prof. Hudnut said; "No." In general the Commission felt the revised design was an improvement over the old. Some further study is to be given to details.

7. MASTER PLAN, SOLDIERS' HOME GROUNDS: By direction of Colonel Alan J. McCutchen, Mr. S. E. Sanders, City Planner, 1832 K Street, Northwest, presented to the Commission a Master Plan for the development of the Soldiers' Home Grounds. The Commission inspected the plan. It was drawn on a scale of 200 Ft. to the inch, with contours showing at intervals of five feet. The buildings and grounds are to accommodate 6500 veteran soldiers—5,000 men as residents and 1500 in the hospital.

A discussion of the Master Plan followed, which Mr. Sanders explained in detail. A copy of the discussion is attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes (Exhibit B).

The Commission made a number of criticisms. Mr. Peets drafted a report embodying the criticisms and suggestions, a copy of which was sent to the members of the Commission and approved. The report was sent to Colonel McCutchen (Exhibit C).

8. WASHINGTON AQUEDUCT, LITTLE FALLS: Colonel Alan J. McCutchen, District Engineer, submitted a design for a new pumping station to supplement the water

supply of Washington D. C. This pumping station is to be built at the Little Falls Dam, about 2½ miles above Georgetown.

Colonel McCutchen said that the design was made in his office, and it included a bridge to cross the old Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. This pumping station, he said, is to make it possible to increase the water supply of Washington D. C. to a maximum of 500,000,000 gallons a day.

A copy of the discussion is attached hereto and made a part of these minutes (Exhibit D). The Commission inspected the design and expressed general interest in it. The design was approved, and a report was sent to Colonel McCutchen (Exhibit D-1).

9. MURAL PAINTINGS FOR THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTING OFFICE BUILDING:

Mr. L. L. Hunter, Acting Supervising Architect, and Mr. C. David Persina, Chief of Design, Public Buildings Service, conferred with the Commission of Fine Arts regarding the selection of a mural painter for a painting in the office of the Comptroller General in the General Accounting Office Building at Fifth and G Streets, Northwest. The Commission were not familiar with the works of Mr. John Chapman Lewis, and Mr. John Howard Maxwell, which were mentioned by Mr. Hunter and Mr. Persina.

A copy of the discussion is attached hereto and made a part of these minutes (Exhibit E). The Commission asked that information be secured regarding the executed works of Mr. Lewis, and Mr. Maxwell for consideration at the next meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts.

10. PORTRAIT OF SECRETARY BRANNAN FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE:

Under date of November 13, 1952, the following letter was received from Mr. Arthur B. Thatcher, Director of Plant and Operations:

"Dear Mr. Finley:

The Secretary of Agriculture, Charles F. Brannan, plans to leave the Department in the very near future, and in accordance

Mr. Arthur E. Thatcher, Director of Plans and Operations

Under date of November 13, 1952, the following letter was received from

"Dear Mr. Finley:

Leave the Department in this very near future, may I express

with the custom of this Department we are desirous of making plans for issuing a commission for the painting of his portrait.

In view of the time which has elapsed since we received your last list of portrait painters whose work is acceptable to the Commission of Fine Arts, it is desired that you provide a more current list.

Very truly yours,
Sgd. Arthur B. Thatcher
Director of Plant and Operations"

A copy of the letter was sent to Mr. Biddle for consideration and recommendation of portrait painters of whom the Department of Agriculture could make their selection.

The Commission discussed the subject at the meeting and agreed upon the following list:

Alexander Brook - 683 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York;

Eugene Speicher - 165 East 60th Street, New York, New York;

Franklin Watkins - 2130 Spring Street, Philadelphia 3, Pa.;

Luigi Lucioni - 33 West 10th Street, New York, New York;

Raphael Soyer - 1947 Broadway, New York, New York.

The names, as above indicated, were transmitted verbally to Mr. Thatcher.

11. WEATHER COVER FOR THE CARTER BARRON AMPHITHEATER: Under date of November 10, 1952, Chairman Finley received the following letter from Congressman Howell:

"Dear Mr. Finley:

I have under consideration at the present time a proposal to include specific authorization of funds to provide a weather cover for the Carter Barron Amphitheater in my bill to establish a National War Memorial Arts Commission, thereby completing the amphitheater built by the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission. I would be very grateful to you for any comments you might care to make on this matter.

Mr. Paul Hume of the Washington Post on August 24, 1952, and Dr. Glenn Dillard Gunn of the Washington Times-Herald on August 3, 1952, urged that such a cover be provided. A number of letters to the Star and the Post, some of which are enclosed, have called for such a weather cover or roof, The main burden of these letters seems to be that the world-famous Boston Symphony Orchestra has a Symphony Hall and a roofed summer music shed, and that both have contributed importantly to the musical eminence of that great symphony orchestra by helping it to become financially stable; and that the cultural flowering of Boston stems in part from these two structures. It is

with the custom of this Department to use decisions of meeting
plans for issuing a commission for the painting of the portrait.

In view of the time which has elapsed since we received your last list of portrait painters whose work is acceptable to the Commission of Fine Arts, it is desired that you provide a more current list.

Very truly yours,
Dred. Arthur B. Tompkins
Director of Mints and Operations

A copy of the letter was sent to Mr. Biddle for consideration and recommendation of portrait painters of whom the Department of Agriculture could make their selection.

The Commission discussed the subject at the meeting and agreed upon the following list:

Alexander Brook - 6659 Fifth Avenue, Pine Tree, New York;
Eugene Speicher - 149 East 60th Street, New York, New York;
Franklin Watkins - 2130 Spring Street, Philadelphia 3, Pa.;
Luigi Lucioni - 33 West 10th Street, New York, New York;
Reginal Sayer - 1947 Broadway, New York, New York.

The names as above furnished, were transmitted verbally to Mr. Tompkins.

11. CONTRACT GIVEN FOR THE STATUE BEHIND MEMORIAL AMPHITHEATRE: Under date of November 10, 1932, Sherman Phisley received the following letter from Congressman Howell:

Dear Mr. Finley:

I have under consideration at the present time a proposal to include specific authorization of funds to provide a modern cover for the Daniel Barron Bandstand in my bill to establish a National War Memorial Commission, thereby completing the amphitheater built by the National Capital Park Commission. I would be very grateful to you for any comments you might care to make on this matter.

Mr. Paul Hume of the Washington Post on August 8th, 1932, and Mr. Glenn Dillard Gunn of the Washington Times-Herald on August 3, 1932, urged that such a cover be provided. A number of letters to the Star and the Post, some of which are enclosed, have called for such a weather cover or roof. The main burden of these letters seems to be that the world-famous Lewis Symphony Orchestra has a Symphony Hall and a modern outdoor music shell, and that both have contributed immeasurably to the musical entertainment of that great symphony orchestra by helping it to become financially stable; and that the cultural itinerary of Boston stops to pause from three to six months. It is

an interesting and no doubt important thesis.

In his Washington Post article urging that a cover be provided Mr. Hume said in part:

> Both weather and proper place for many kinds of musical events can be solved in one move, if the right action is taken.
>
> Carter Barron Amphitheater is beautifully situated and a comfortable, well designed theater. It has some of the finest lighting equipment in the country, and a stage of breadth and depth. That the people of Washington are glad to go there, and can find the way via public and private transportation has been amply proved in two summers of "Faith Of Our Fathers," and this summer's ballet.
>
> But the amphitheater was built without any care for the realities of weather. You cannot tell me that the right know-how cannot design at reasonable cost an ingenious covering for that theater, one that will not be noisy in case of rain, but practicable in design and material.
>
> Risk minimized, organizations will come forward to give Washington real entertainment during the summer. The backers of the Ballet Russe had $46,000 at stake. Few individuals or institutions can do that. But why should anyone need to when the proper covering would make it unnecessary to guarantee so much in the face of weather dangers.

I have the deep conviction that the Congress expected that the Carter Barron Amphitheater would be of continuing usefulness to the people of this city, and the visitors who come here from all corners of the Nation. No doubt the Congress would be quite willing to appropriate the money required to give this handsome structure the roof that would make it serviceable throughout Washington's hot summer months. Please return the enclosures when they have served their purpose.

Sincerely yours,
Sgd. Charles R. Howell"

The Commission considered the subject and also called attention to a copy of a letter received from the office of the National Capital Parks, pertaining to this matter (Exhibit F).

The Commission felt that since the Carter Barron Theater is an out-door theater, it should not require a weather cover. However, the Commission noted that in a draft of a bill, which is to be introduced in Congress, there is an item to provide funds from Congress for this weather cover.

12. SENATE BILL TO CREATE A WAR MEMORIAL FINE ARTS COMMISSION: The Commission of Fine Arts received a committee print of this proposed legislation

which is to be introduced in the next Congress, which convenes on January 3, 1953. The Commission considered various items mentioned in the bill and felt that it is proposed to organize it on a huge scale. The Commission noted particularly that request is to be made for the first year for an appropriation of one-million dollars, and twenty-million each year thereafter. Also that there are to be 34 members on that Commission, of which the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts is to be a member.

Also the Commission took particular note of the fact that this proposed War Memorial Commission is to administer an opera house in the National Capital.

The Commission recognized the fact that an opera house in Washington D. C. is much needed, but felt it might be better to place it in the custody of the Public Buildings Service, in the General Services Administration.

A letter was sent to Congressman Howell (Exhibit G).

13. OFFICE BUILDING AT 425 THIRTEENTH STREET, NORTHWEST: The Secretary submitted a set of plans received from the Inspector of Buildings (Shipstead-Luce Act No. 1538, dated, December 12, 1952) for an Office Building at Thirteenth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W. The Commission inspected the design. It was designed in the contemporary style of architecture. Mr. Edwin Weihe, Architect, was present.

Mr. Weihe said: "We were here by your permission at the last meeting (October 22, 1952), and showed a preliminary sketch, and it was considered to be satisfactory, subject to submission of detailed drawings. We present these today. We know you are concerned particularly with the exterior appearance of the building.

It is a flat plate job with vertical peripheries on the outer columns. The space between floors will be 8 feet 11 inches. The first floor will be used for stores and the second floor sets back on the first floor only four inches.

The building will be built in limestone, and will thus be in harmony with the Post Office Department Building across the street along Pennsylvania Avenue. At the 110 foot height there will be a set-back as required by the D. C. Zoning Regulations. Between the spandrels we use a slightly darker limestone, but the predominance of the material would be buff.

Professor Belluschi commented on the use of a narrow strip of granite, shown in the design; and the other about the treatment of a recess on the first floor, and one pier is shown wider than another.

Mr. Weihe said; "In general, I have had a feeling that if I dropped the same basic pattern down directly over the store to the first, second floor line, that I might get a little squat feeling on the second floor which I do not particularly like. That was the basic idea."

Professor Hudnut said: "Don't you think the overhanging corner should be a little more substantial--you could carry it around rather than let it hang out over the point.

Mr. Weihe replied: "I will be perfectly happy to. It was one of the things that we worried about, frankly."

Professor Belluschi said, "We all are. But if we can give a suggestion that would strengthen the design, that would be better."

Mr. Weihe replied, "I will push that. But I only wanted to emphasize that that was the office entrance without objecting to the broadening of the pier at that point."

Mr. Belluschi remarked: "Just a different approach. You have an arch there which is really not an arch. You have a big mass and these are supports (indicating). I think you can emphasize that by eliminating that which will give more height if you have no structural impediment there."

Mr. Peets said: "Are you sure that that should be that way and not like this? (Indicating). That, of course, is an obtuse angle, but it is only

18 degrees, or something like that, more than a right angle."

Mr. Weihe replied: "I am not here on procedure. We would like to make those changes that the members have suggested with permission then to ask for our permit to start the building."

Professor Belluschi thereupon moved approval of the design, by saying,"I move that we approve the design with the recommendation that certain minor changes be made if they are acceptable to the architect and his client."

The motion was seconded, and when put to vote was unanimously carried. The Inspector of Buildings was notified accordingly.

Mr. Weihe thanked the Commission for their action and said, "I will make those changes on the blueprints and note those things to be eliminated. My client is the kind of man who wanted to dig the hole yesterday to begin the operation.

14. RESIDENCE FOR 8300 WEST BEACH DRIVE, NORTHWEST: Shipstead-Luce Act Case No. 1534; dated, November 20, 1952. The Inspector of Buildings submitted a set of drawings (Shipstead-Luce Act Submission No. 1534, dated November 20, 1952, for a residence at this location.

The Commission inspected the design. Professor Hudnut said, "No comment;" and upon his recommendation the Commission approved the design. The Building Inspector was notified accordingly.

15. GOVERNMENT AND ART: The Commission considered various phases of the proposed Report on Government and Art. It is to be made the subject of special consideration at the next meeting of the Commission, when particular attention is to be given to the Introduction, and to the Recommendations of the Commission of Fine Arts, which are to be made to the President.

16. NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: The Commission decided to hold the next meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts in Washington D. C. on Tuesday, February 3, 1953.

The Commission adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

C O P Y

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

M E M B E R S

CITIZEN MEMBERS (appointed by the President)

Dr. Joseph D. Lohman, Chairman, Chicago, Ill.	- term expires	4/30/57
Mr. Albert P. Greensfelder, St. Louis, Mo.	- term expires	4/29/53
Mr. Frederick Bigger, Pittsburgh, Penna.	- " "	4/29/54
Mr. Hilyard R. Robinson, D. C.	- " "	4/29/55
Mr. John A. Remon, D. C.	- " "	4/29/~~58~~56

EX OFFICIO

Chief of Engineers, U. S. Army
Lt. Gen. Lewis A. Pick
(Alternate) Col. Earl E. Gesler
Director, National Park Service
Mr. Conrad L. Wirth
(Alternates) Mr. Hillory A. Tolson, Assistant Director
Mr. Ronald F. Lee " "
Mr. Thomas J. Allen " "
Mr. Thomas C. Vint, Chief, Design and Construction
Engineer Commissioner, District of Columbia
Brig. Gen. Bernard L. Robinson
(Alternates) Col. Thomas J. Hayes
Lt. Col. Harry F. Hansen
Commissioner of Public Buildings
W. E. Reynolds
Commissioner, Bureau Public Roads
Thomas H. MacDonald
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, U. S. Senate
Hon. Matthew M. Neely (or his designated alternate)
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, House of Representatives
Hon. John L. McMillan (or his designated alternate)

O F F I C E R S

Chairman - Dr. Joseph D. Lohman
Vice Chairman - Mr. Conrad L. Wirth

C O M M I T T E S

Executive Committee - Dr. Joseph D. Lohman, Chairman
Director, National Park Service
Engineer Commissioner, D. C.

Committee on Procedure - Mr. Frederick Bigger - Chairman
Director, National Park Service
Mr. Hilyard R. Robinson
Engineer Commissioner, D. C.

General Plans Committee - Mr. Frederick Bigger - Chairman
All the members of the Commission - as members

Zoning Committee -

EXHIBIT A

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

M E M B E R S

CITIZEN MEMBERS (appointed by the President)

Dr. Joseph D. Lohman, Chairman, Chicago, Ill.	– term expires	4/30/57
Mr. Albert P. Greensfelder, St. Louis, Mo.	– term expires	4/29/53
Mr. Frederick Bigger, Pittsburgh, Penna.	– " "	4/29/54
Mr. Hilyard R. Robinson, D. C.	– " "	4/29/55
Mr. John A. Remon, D. C.	– " "	4/29/56

EX OFFICIO

Chief of Engineers, U. S. Army
Lt. Gen. Lewis A. Pick
(Alternate) Col. Earl M. Cesler
Director, National Park Service
Mr. Conrad L. Wirth
(Alternates) Mr. Hillory A. Tolson, Assistant Director
" Mr. Ronald F. Lee " "
" Mr. Thomas J. Allen " "
Mr. Thomas C. Vint, Chief, Design and Construction
Engineer Commissioner, District of Columbia
Brig. Gen. Bernard I. Robinson
(Alternates) Col. Thomas J. Hayes
Lt. Col. Harry F. Hansen
Commissioner of Public Buildings
W. E. Reynolds
Commissioner, Bureau Public Roads
Thomas H. MacDonald
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, U. S. Senate
Hon. Matthew M. Neely (or his designated alternate)
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, House of Representatives
Hon. John L. McMillan (or his designated alternate)

O F F I C E R S

Chairman – Dr. Joseph D. Lohman
Vice Chairman – Mr. Conrad L. Wirth

C O M M I T T E E S

Executive Committee – Dr. Joseph D. Lohman, Chairman
Director, National Park Service
Engineer Commissioner, D. C.

Committee on Procedure – Mr. Frederick Bigger – Chairman
Director, National Park Service
Mr. Hilyard R. Robinson
Engineer Commissioner, D. C.

General Plans Committee – Mr. Frederick Bigger – Chairman
All the members of the Commission – as members

Zoning Committee –

COMMISSION STAFF

Director	-	Mr. John Nolen, Jr.
Executive Officer	-	Mr. Blair Lee III
General Counsel and Secretary	-	Mr. William S. Cheatham
Assistant Secretary	-	Mr. Carl R. Nolte
Chief, Projects and Design	-	Mr. Ray M. Schenck
Landscape Architect	-	Mr. Ellis F. Price
Land Purchasing Officer	-	Mr. Edward Grotecloss, Jr.

C O O R D I N A T I N G C O M M I T T E E

Officers:

Mr. E. A. Schmitt, - Chairman
Mr. John Nolen, Jr., - Vice Chairman
Mr. Blair Lee III - Secretary

District of Columbia Government:

Assistant Engineer Commissioner
Lt. Col. Harry F. Hansen
Director of Highways
Mr. J. N. Robertson
(Alternate) - Mr. W. D. Heath
Director of Sanitary Engineering
Mr. Harold A. Kemp
(Alternate) - Mr. D. V. Auld
Surveyor
Mr. Francis F. Healy
(Alternate) - Mr. Kenneth G. Fernald
Director of Vehicles and Traffic
Mr. George E. Keneipp
(Alternate) - Mr. W. L. Braun

National Park Service:

Chief of Design and Construction -
Mr. Thomas Vint
(Alternate) - Mr. Merel S. Sager
Superintendent of National Capital Parks
Mr. Edward J. Kelly
(Alternates) - Mr. Harry T. Thompson
Mr. Frank T. Gartside
Mr. Robert C. Horne

Washington District Office, Corps of Engineers:
Head Engineer (Chief, Water Supply Division)
Mr. E. A. Schmitt

Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration:
Supervising Architect, Design Branch
Mr. Allan S. Thorn
(Alternate) - Mr. C. F. Hagemann

COMMISSION STAFF

Director	–	Mr. John Nolen, Jr.
Executive Officer	–	Mr. Blair Lee III
General Counsel and Secretary	–	Mr. William S. Gwatkin
Assistant Secretary	–	Mr. Carl R. Nolte
Chief, Projects and Design	–	Mr. Ray M. Schenck
Landscape Architect	–	Mr. Ellis F. Price
Land Purchasing Officer	–	Mr. Edward Grotelose, Jr.

C O O R D I N A T I N G C O M M I T T E E

Officers:

Mr. E. A. Schmitt, – Chairman
Mr. John Nolen, Jr., – Vice Chairman
Mr. Blair Lee III – Secretary

District of Columbia Government:

Assistant Engineer Commissioner
Lt. Col. Harry F. Hansen
Director of Highways
Mr. J. E. Robertson
(Alternate) – Mr. W. D. Heath
Director of Sanitary Engineering
Mr. Harold A. Kemp
(Alternate) – Mr. D. V. Auld
Surveyor
Mr. Francis F. Healy
(Alternate) – Mr. Kenneth G. Fernald
Director of Vehicles and Traffic
Mr. George E. Kemelgo
(Alternate) – Mr. W. E. Braun

National Park Service:

Chief of Design and Construction –
Mr. Thomas Vint
(Alternate) – Mr. Merel S. Sager
Superintendent of National Capital Parks
Mr. Edward J. Kelly
(Alternates) – Mr. Percy T. Thompson
Mr. Frank T. Cartledge
Mr. Robert C. Horne

Washington District Office, Corps of Engineers:
Head Engineer (Chief, Water Supply Division)

Public Law 592 - 82d Congress
Chapter 949 - 2d Session
H. R. 7502

approved July 19-1952

AN ACT

To amend the Act of June 6, 1924, as amended, relating to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Act approved June 6, 1924, entitled "An Act providing for a comprehensive development of the park and playground system of the National Capital" (43 Stat. 463), as amended, is hereby further amended by substituting in lieu thereof the following:

National Capital Planning Act of 1952.
40 U.S.C. §71.

GENERAL PURPOSES, FINDINGS, AND DEFINITIONS

"SECTION 1. (a) It is the purpose of this Act to secure comprehensive planning for the physical development of the National Capital and its environs; to provide for the participation of the appropriate planning agencies of the environs in such planning; and to establish the agency and procedures requisite to the administration of the functions of the Federal and District of Columbia governments related to such planning. The Congress hereby finds that the location of the seat of government in the District of Columbia has brought about the development of a metropolitan region extending well into adjoining territory in Maryland and Virginia; that effective comprehensive planning is necessary on a regional basis and of continuing importance to the Federal establishment; that the distribution of Federal installations throughout the region has been and will continue to be a major influence in determining the extent and character of development; that there is needed a central planning agency for the National Capital region to coordinate certain developmental activities of the many different agencies of the Federal and District Governments so that such activities may conform with general objectives; that there is an increasing mutuality of interest and responsibility between the various levels of government that calls for coordinate and unified policies in planning both Federal and local development in the interest of order and economy; that there are developmental problems of an interstate character, the planning of which requires collaboration between Federal, State, and local governments in the interest of equity and constructive action; and that the instrumentalities and procedures herein provided will aid in providing the Congress from time to time with information and advice requisite to legislation. The general objective of this Act is to enable appropriate agencies to plan for the development of the Federal establishment at the seat of government in a manner consistent with the nature and function of the National Capital and with due regard for the rights and prerogatives of the adjoining States and local governments to exercise control appropriate to their functions, and in a manner which will, in accordance with present and future needs, best promote public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity, and the general welfare, as well as efficiency and economy in the process of development.

66 Stat. 781.
66 Stat. 782.

"(b) As used in this Act, (1) 'region' or 'National Capital region' means the District of Columbia; Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties in Maryland; Arlington, Fairfax, Loudoun, and Prince William Counties in Virginia; and all cities now or hereafter existing in Maryland or Virginia within the geographic area bounded by the outer boundaries of the combined area of said counties; (2) 'environs' means the territory surrounding the District of Columbia included within the National Capital region; (3) 'National Capital' means the District of Columbia and territory owned by the United States within

Definitions.

the environs; and (4) 'planning agency' means any city, county, bi-county, part-county, or regional planning agency authorized under State and local laws to make and adopt comprehensive plans whether or not its jurisdiction is exclusive or concurrent.

"THE NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

"Creation of Commission

"SEC. 2. (a) The National Capital Planning Commission, hereinafter called the 'Commission', is hereby created and designated as the central planning agency for the Federal and District Governments to plan the appropriate and orderly development and redevelopment of the National Capital and the conservation of the important natural and historical features thereof.

"Composition of Commission

"(b) The Commission shall be composed of—

"(1) ex officio, the Chief of Engineers of the Army, the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, the Director of the National Park Service, the Commissioner of Public Buildings, the Commissioner of Public Roads, the chairmen of the committees on the District of Columbia of the Senate and the House of Representatives (either of which chairmen if unable to serve in person may designate another member of his committee to serve as a member of the Commission in his stead) and, in addition,

"(2) five eminent citizens well qualified and experienced in city or regional planning, to be appointed by the President, at least two of whom shall be bona fide residents of the District of Columbia or the environs, including one of such residents who shall be appointed from among not less than three nominees of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the foregoing professional requirements may be waived in the case of the nominees of the Board of Commissioners if in the opinion of the Board of Commissioners said nominee has demonstrated capacity for leadership in the planning and development of the District of Columbia: *And provided further*, That appointive members of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission in office on the effective date of this amendatory Act shall serve out their unexpired terms, as members of the Commission, in lieu of an equal number of members provided for in this paragraph (2). The terms of office of other members first appointed under this paragraph (2) shall be so fixed by the President that the term of one of such five members will expire on April 30 of each of the following years, namely, 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956, 1957, and thereafter the terms of office shall expire every six years following such dates, respectively. Any member of the Commission appointed under this paragraph (2) shall, the expiration of his term notwithstanding, continue as a member, pending the appointment and qualification of the successor. Any person appointed to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The appointive members of the Commission shall receive no compensation as such, but shall be paid a per diem in lieu of subsistence and be reimbursed for the cost of travel when attending meetings of the Commission or engaged in investigations or other specific duties pertaining to its activities, in accordance with applicable law.

Terms of office.

66 Stat. 782.
66 Stat. 783.

"Officers and Employees of Commission

"(c) The President shall designate the Chairman of the Commission and the Commission may elect from among its members such other officers as it deems desirable. The Commission is authorized to employ a Director, an executive officer, and such other technical and administrative personnel as it may deem necessary. Further, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, the civil service and classification laws, or section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), the Commission may employ, by contract or otherwise, the temporary or intermittent (not in excess of one year) services of city planners, architects, engineers, appraisers, and other experts or organizations thereof, as may be necessary to carry out its functions, and in any such case the rate of compensation shall be fixed by the Commission so as not to exceed the rate usual for similar services. 41 U.S.C. §5. 60 Stat. 810.

"Advisory and Coordinating Committees

"(d) The Commission may establish, with the consent of each agency concerned as to its representation, such advisory and coordinating committees composed of representatives of such agencies of the Federal and District of Columbia Governments as may be necessary or helpful to obtain the maximum amount of cooperation and correlation of effort among the various agencies of such Governments, in order that the National Capital may be developed in accordance with the comprehensive plan. As it may deem appropriate, the Commission may invite representatives of the planning and developmental agencies of the environs to participate in the work of such committees.

"General Scope of the Commission's Functions

"(e) As hereinafter more specifically described in sections 4 to 8, it shall be among the principal duties of the Commission to (1) prepare, adopt, and amend a comprehensive plan for the National Capital and make related recommendations to the appropriate developmental agencies; (2) serve as the central planning agency for the Federal and District Governments, within the National Capital region, and in such capacity to review their development programs in order to advise as to consistency with the comprehensive plan; and (3) be the representative of the Federal and District Governments for collaboration with the Regional Planning Council, as hereinafter provided.

"NATIONAL CAPITAL REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

"Establishment and Composition of the Council

"SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established a National Capital Regional Planning Council, hereinafter referred to as the 'Council', to be composed, whenever possible, of representatives of the planning agencies of the region, of demonstrated capacity for leadership in the planning of the region. The Council shall consist of the Chairman of the Commission, ex officio, Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, and not to exceed eight other members who, with their alternates, shall be appointed by the Commission, pursuant to nominations as hereinafter provided. For the Maryland environs, the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission may nominate two of its members, one each for the portions of the Maryland-Washington regional district within Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, respectively, and for the portion of either county without the said Maryland-Washington regional district, the gov- 66 Stat. 783. 66 Stat. 784.

erning bodies of each county may nominate a member of the planning agency for each such portion: *Provided*, That if any portion of either county is without a planning agency the governing body of such county may nominate a qualified person to represent such portion. For the Virginia environs, the Northern Virginia Regional Planning and Economic Development Commission, after soliciting recommendations from the governing bodies of the cities and counties of the Virginia environs, may nominate 4 persons, each of whom shall be a member of a planning agency in the Virginia environs but no more than one of whom shall be from the same city or county. An equal number of alternate members of the Council from the Maryland and Virginia portions of the regions may be nominated by the nominating authorities designated herein. The members of the Council shall receive no compensation for their services on the Council, but may, notwithstanding the provisions of title 18 U. S. C. 1914, continue to accept such compensations as may be paid to them as members of local governmental agencies. The Council shall select its chairman from among its members.

Compensation.

62 Stat. 793.

Additions to region.

"(b) Any county or portion of any county in Maryland or Virginia may hereafter be added to the National Capital region if the local governing body of such county shall so request and if the Commission and the Council shall find that such addition to the region is appropriate and shall accordingly approve such request. Any county or portion of any county so added to the region may participate in the work of the Council according to such terms and conditions as may be mutually agreed upon by the Commission, the Council and the governing body of such county except that no provision for participation shall permit an increase in the number of members of the Council as herein constituted.

"Services and Facilities

"(c) The Commission shall make available to the Council such technical and clerical assistance and such other services and facilities as may be necessary for the performance of the functions of the Council. The Council may accept such assistance, services, and facilities as may be made available by any State or local governmental authority having jurisdiction in the areas in which the agencies herein authorized to nominate members of the Council have jurisdiction.

"Preparation of Regional Plan

"(d) The Council is authorized to adopt and, from time to time, amend, or extend, a general plan for the development of the region, to serve as a general framework or guide of development within which each part of the region may be more precisely planned by the appropriate planning agency or agencies. The regional plan shall include a land-use plan which designates the proposed general distribution and general locations and extents of the uses of land for such categories as may have important influence on the development of the region; and in addition, such other elements of a general plan having over-all influence as are required to provide for the proposed major movements of people and goods throughout the region, for the primary facilities for community development and for the conservation and development of natural resources. As the basis for its plans, the Council shall at all times give consideration to those features of any plan duly adopted by the Commission or any planning agency appropriate for incorporation in the general plan for the region. The Council shall also consider and aim to accommodate the land-use requirements of the Federal and District Governments in the environs.

66 Stat. 784.

66 Stat. 785.

These provisions shall not operate to prevent the Council from proposing changes, additions, or substitutions for consideration by any of the planning agencies of the region.

"Additional Responsibilities

"(e) The Council shall collaborate with the Commission and promote collaboration and cooperation between the Commission and the planning agencies of the environs and the Maryland and Virginia State planning agencies. To that end, it may assemble and interchange information, conduct surveys essential to its work, and in general seek to reconcile the plans and proposals of the planning agencies of the region. It may also cooperate with the planning or other public agencies having jurisdiction in the area beyond the boundaries of the region. It may, at its discretion, periodically provide opportunity by public hearings, meetings, or conferences, exhibitions and publication of its plans, for review and comments by nongovernmental groups and the general public. The Council shall report annually on the progress of its work to the Commission and to the agencies which are represented thereon. At any time subsequent to three years after the approval of this Act, the Council may make recommendations to the Commission or other agencies represented on the Council for any legislation which, as the result of its experience, it may deem desirable to make its general purpose more effective. Council reports.

"Actions of Council

"(f) In making any recommendation, adopting any plan, or approving any proposal, action shall be taken by a majority vote of all members of the Council: *Provided, however*, That no action affecting directly a single local planning jurisdiction may be approved except by the affirmative vote of the member representing that jurisdiction: *Provided further*, That in the case of an action involving more than one jurisdiction, the negative votes of a minority of the Council shall be made a matter of record and shown on all plans adopted. No vote by any member of the Council shall be construed as an official commitment of the agency represented by the member unless so authorized by said agency.

"COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR THE NATIONAL CAPITAL

"Preparation and Adoption

"SEC. 4 (a) The Commission is hereby charged with the duty of preparing and adopting a comprehensive, consistent, and coordinated plan for the National Capital, which plan shall include the Commission's recommendations or proposals for Federal and District developments or projects in the environs. The Commission shall collaborate with the Council in the development of those elements of the plan for the National Capital which should be incorporated in the regional plan provided for in section 3. While consistency between the respective proposals of the Commission and the Council shall be sought, lack of action or agreement by the Council shall not prevent the Commission from adopting any part of its plan within the District of Columbia or any recommendation or proposal for Federal or District developments or projects in the environs. The Commission may include in its plan any portion of any plan adopted by the Council or any planning agency in the environs and from time to time make recommendations of collateral interest to the Council or to the aforesaid agencies. 66 Stat. 785. 66 Stat. 786.

"Content of Plan

"(b) The Commission's plan for the National Capital shall show its recommendations for the development of the District of Columbia and may include, among other things, the general location, arrangement, character, and extent of highways, streets, bridges, viaducts, subways, major thoroughfares, and other facilities for the handling of traffic; parks, parkways and recreation areas, and the facilities for their development and use; public buildings and structures, including monuments and memorials, public reservations or property, such as airports, parking areas, institutions, and open spaces; land use, zoning, and the density or distribution of population; public utilities and services for the transportation of people and goods or the supply of community facilities; waterway and water-front development; redevelopment of obsolescent, blighted, or slum areas; neighborhood areas; projects affecting the amenities of life, the preservation and conservation of natural scenery and resources, and features of historic and scientific interest and educational value; and all other proper elements of city and regional planning. The plan may include appropriate maps, plats, charts, tables, and descriptive, interpretive and analytical matter, economic and social aspects, and trends of urban development, and such functional and sectional plans as the Commission deems necessary or desirable. The Commission's recommendations or proposals for Federal and District developments or projects in the environs may include their general location, character, size, and intensity of use and such general plans for their development as may be necessary to present the Commission's recommendations to the appropriate authorities.

"Generalized Elements of the Plan

"(c) As a general frame of reference for the Commission in making its recommendations under the foregoing subsection (b), the Commission shall at all times give primary consideration to the broad elements of the plan which shall include, but not be limited to, generalized plans for land use, major thoroughfares, park, parkway, and recreation system, mass transportation, and community facilities and services. These generalized plans shall also be the basis for integrating the Commission's proposals with those of the Council and for the general purpose of guiding and accomplishing a coordinated, comprehensive, adjusted, and systematic development of the National Capital and its environs.

66 Stat.786.
66 Stat.787.

"Progressive Adoption, Amendment, or Review

"(d) The Commission may, as the work of preparing the comprehensive plan progresses, adopt any element or a part or parts thereof and from time to time shall review and may amend or extend the plan, in order that its recommendations may be kept up to date.

"Consultation With Interested Agencies

"(e) Prior to the final adoption of the comprehensive plan or any element thereof, or any subsequent revision, the Commission shall present such plan, element, or revision to the appropriate Federal or District of Columbia authorities for comment and recommendations. Presentation of proposed revisions may at the Commission's discretion be made annually in a consolidated form. The said recommendations by Federal and District of Columbia authorities shall not be binding on the Commission, but it shall give careful consideration to

such views and recommendations as are submitted prior to final adoption. The Commission may, in addition and at its discretion, periodically provide opportunity by public hearings, meetings, or conferences, exhibitions and publication of its plans, for review and comments by nongovernmental agencies or groups, and, in consultation with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, encourage the formation of one or more citizen advisory councils.

"In carrying out its planning functions with respect to Federal developments or projects in the environs, the Commission may act in conjunction and cooperation and enter into agreements with any State or local authority or planning agency, as the Commission may deem necessary, to effectuate the adoption of any plan or proposal and secure its realization.

"PROPOSED FEDERAL AND DISTRICT DEVELOPMENTS AND PROJECTS

"General Procedure for Consultation With Commission

"SEC. 5. (a) In order to insure the comprehensive planning and orderly development of the National Capital, each Federal and District of Columbia agency prior to the preparation of construction plans originated by such agency for proposed developments and projects or to commitments for the acquisition of land, to be paid for in whole or in part from Federal or District funds, shall advise and consult with the Commission in the preparation by the agency of plans and programs in preliminary and successive stages which affect the plan and development of the National Capital: *Provided, however*, That the Commission shall determine in advance the type or kinds of plans, developments, projects, improvements, or acquisitions which do not need to be submitted for review by the Commission as to conformity with its plans. After receipt of such plans, maps, and data, it shall be the duty of the Commission to make promptly a preliminary report and recommendations to the agency or agencies concerned. If, after having received and considered the report and recommendations of the Commission the agency does not concur, it shall advise the Commission with its reasons therefor, and the Commission shall submit a final report. After such consultation and suitable consideration of the views of the Commission the agency may proceed to take action in accordance with its legal responsibilities and authority. 66 Stat. 787. 66 Stat. 788.

"Exceptions

"(b) The procedure prescribed in subsection 5 (a) hereof shall not apply to projects within the Capitol grounds or to structures erected by the Department of Defense during wartime or national emergency within existing military, naval, or Air Force reservations, except that the appropriate defense agency shall consult with the Commission as to any developments which materially affect traffic or require coordinated planning of the surrounding area.

"Approval of District Government Buildings in the Central Area

"(c) The provisions of section 16 of the Act approved June 20, 1938 (52 Stat. 802), are extended to include public buildings erected by any agency of the Government of the District of Columbia within the boundaries of the central area of the District as said central area may be defined and from time to time redefined by concurrent action of the Commission and the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. D.C. Code §5-428.

"Additional Procedure for Consultation on Developments and Projects in the Environs

"(d) Within the environs, general plans showing the location, character, extent and intensity of use for proposed Federal and District developments and projects involving the acquisition of land, shall be submitted to the Commission for report and recommendations before final commitment to said acquisition, unless such matters shall have been specifically approved by an Act of Congress. Before acting on any general plan, the Commission shall advise and consult with the Council and the appropriate planning agency having jurisdiction over the affected part of the environs. When, in the judgment of the Commission, proposed developments or projects submitted to the Commission under subsection (a) hereof involve a major change in the character or intensity of an existing use in the environs, the Commission shall likewise advise and consult with the Council and the aforesaid planning agency. The report and recommendations required under this subsection shall be submitted within sixty days and shall be accompanied by any reports or recommendations that may have been prepared by the Council or the aforesaid planning agency.

"(e) It is the intent of the foregoing provisions of this section to obtain cooperation and correlation of effort between the various agencies of the Federal and District Governments which are responsible for public developments and projects, including the acquisition of land. These agencies, therefore, shall look to the Commission and utilize it as the central planning agency for the Federal and District Governments in the National Capital region. To aid the Commission in carrying out this function, plans, data, and records, or copies thereof, necessary to the Commission shall be furnished upon its request by such Federal and District governmental agencies; and the Commission shall likewise furnish related plans, data, and records, or copies thereof, to Federal and District of Columbia governmental agencies upon request.

66 Stat. 788.
66 Stat. 789.

"THOROUGHFARE PLAN

"Preparation and Adoption of Thoroughfare and Transportation Plans for the District of Columbia

"SEC. 6. (a) As elements of the comprehensive plan described in section 4 above, the Commission shall prepare a major thoroughfare plan and a mass transportation plan. The major thoroughfare plan may include established and proposed routes. Following the preparation and adoption by the Commission of the major thoroughfare plan, or parts thereof, it shall be submitted to the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and if approved by the said Board shall be deemed to be the approved plan. Revisions in the major thoroughfare plan or parts thereof shall similarly require the adoption by the Commission and approval by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. The mass transportation plan shall be prepared, adopted, approved, or revised in the same manner as prescribed herein, for the major thoroughfare plan except that the Joint Board provided for in section 6 (e) of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended (sec. 603 (e), title 40, D. C. Code), shall be responsible for its approval and approval of subsequent revisions. Revision of the major thoroughfare plan or parts thereof and the mass transportation plan may be proposed by the Commission and may also be proposed by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia with respect to the thoroughfare plan and by said Joint Board with respect to the mass transportation plan.

46 Stat. 1424.

"Thoroughfare Plan Serving Federal and District Needs in the Environs

"(b) Prior to final adoption of the thoroughfare plan and its submission to the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia for approval under the foregoing subsection, the Commission shall consult with the Council and the planning agencies affected regarding the Commission's recommendations for extension of the thoroughfare system of the District of Columbia to serve Federal and District developments and projects in the environs. Such recommendations shall be made after consultation with the Bureau of Public Roads, the National Park Service, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the appropriate State highway agencies. The Council may review the Commission's recommendations as to consistency with its general plan for the region and submit a report thereon, which the Commission shall transmit with its own recommendations to the Bureau of Public Roads as a guide to portions of the regional thoroughfare plan included or to be included in the Federal-aid highway system. After consideration of such report and recommendations, the Bureau of Public Roads may proceed to take action in accordance with its legal responsibilities and authority.

"SIX-YEAR PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

"SEC. 7. The Commission shall recommend a six-year program of public works projects which it shall review annually with the agencies concerned. To this end each Federal agency and the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall submit to the Commission in the first quarter of each fiscal year a copy of its advance program of capital improvements within the National Capital and its environs. 66 Stat. 789. 66 Stat. 790.

"ZONING AND SUBDIVISION FUNCTIONS

"Amendments of Zoning Regulations and Maps

"SEC. 8. (a) The Commission may make a report and recommendation to the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia on proposed amendments of the zoning regulations and maps as to the relation or conformity of such amendments with the comprehensive plan of the District of Columbia. The Commission may also submit to the said Zoning Commission proposed amendments or general revisions to the zoning regulations or the zoning map for said District.

"Further Report on Zoning Matters

"(b) When requested by a properly authorized representative of the Commission, the Zoning Commission may at its discretion recess for a reasonable period of time any public hearing held by it to consider a proposed amendment to the zoning regulations or map, in order that the Commission or its representative may have an opportunity to present to the Zoning Commission a further report on the proposed amendment.

"Zoning Committee

"(c) The functions vested in the Commission pursuant to this section may, to such extent as the Commission shall determine, and subject to confirmation by the Commission when requested by the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia, be performed by a committee of the Commission which shall be known as the Zoning Committee of the National Capital Planning Commission and shall

consist of not less than three members of the Commission designated by the Commission for the purpose. The number of members serving on the Zoning Committee may be varied from time to time.

"Recommendations as to Platting and Subdividing of Lands

"(d) Any proposed change in or addition to the regulations or general orders regulating the platting and subdividing of lands and grounds in the District of Columbia shall first be submitted to the Commission by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia for report and recommendation prior to adoption by such Board. Should the Board not concur in the recommendations of the Commission, it shall so advise the Commission with its reasons therefor and the Commission shall submit a final report within thirty days. After consideration of this final report, the Board may proceed to take action in accordance with its legal responsibilities and authority. It shall be the duty of the Commission to submit any proposed changes in or amendments to the general orders that the Commission considers appropriate and the Board of Commissioners shall treat the amendments proposed in the same manner as other proposed amendments.

"TRANSFERS FROM PREDECESSOR AGENCY

"SEC. 9. All other functions, powers, and duties of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, including those formerly vested in the Highway Commission established by the Act of March 2, 1893 (27 Stat. 532), and those formerly vested in the National Capital Park Commission by the Act of June 6, 1924 (43 Stat. 463), together with the personnel, records, property, and unexpended balances (available or to be made available) of appropriations, allocations, and all other funds, including trust funds, of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, are hereby transferred to the Commission.

D.C. Code §§7-108 to 7-112.
40 U.S.C. §§71-74.
66 Stat. 790.
66 Stat. 791.

"APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated and in any appropriate appropriation Act other than the annual District of Columbia Appropriation Act, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of sections 1 to 10 of this Act, as amended, any existing provisions of law to the contrary notwithstanding."

40 U.S.C. §§72-74.

SEC. 2. Sections 2, 3, and 4 of the Act approved June 6, 1924, as amended, shall be renumbered as sections 11, 12, and 13. Sections 1 and 2 of this Act may be cited as the "National Capital Planning Act of 1952".

Short title.

D.C. Code §§8-102 note, 8-106 note.

SEC. 3. The first section of the Act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 482), as amended, authorizing appropriations for the acquisition and development of lands for the park and parkway system of the National Capital, is hereby amended—

(1) by striking out "$9,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$13,500,000".

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(c) For the extension of the park and parkway system of the National Capital in the Virginia environs of Washington, as may be agreed upon between the National Capital Planning Commission and a park authority established under the Park Authorities Act of the State of Virginia (and such other public bodies as may be authorized under the laws of the State of Virginia), up the valleys of Hunting Creek, Cameron Run, Holmes Run, Tripps Run, Four Mile Run,

Pimmit Run, Accotink Creek, and tributaries of such streams, and over other desirable lands, $4,500,000. No part of such sum shall be expended by the United States for any unit of such extension until the National Capital Planning Commission has received definite commitments from such park authority (and other public bodies) of the State of Virginia for two-thirds of the cost of acquiring the lands in its judgment necessary for such unit of the extension deemed by the Commission sufficiently complete. The title to the lands acquired hereunder shall vest in, and the development and administration thereof shall be under, such park authority or the State of Virginia in accordance with plans approved by the National Capital Planning Commission. Such lands shall not be used for any purpose other than the development and completion of the extension of the park and parkway system provided for in this paragraph, except with the approval and consent of the National Capital Planning Commission. No appropriation authorized in this paragraph shall be available for expenditure until a suitable agreement has been entered into between the National Capital Planning Commission and the appropriate local authority as to sewage disposal and storm-water flow." Restrictions.

Approved July 19, 1952.

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1952 O - 22744

Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration:
Supervising Architect, Design Branch
Mr. Allan G. Thorn
(Alternate) - Mr. C. E. Hagemann

National Capital Planning Commission:

Director - Mr. John Nolen, Jr.
Executive Officer - Mr. Blair Lee III
Chief of Projects and Design - Mr. Ray M. Schenck
General Counsel and Secretary - Mr. William S. Cheatham

Members of equal standing but attending meetings only when discussion of matters pertaining to their agencies requires it:

District of Columbia Government
Executive Officer, Zoning Commission
Mr. R. O. Clouser
Municipal Architect
Mr. Merrell A. Coe
Fire Marshal
Mr. R. C. Roberts

Redevelopment Land Agency
Executive Director
Mr. John R. Searles

Architect of the Capitol
Mr. David A. Lynn

National Capital Housing Authority
Executive Director
Mr. John Ihlder

Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission
Director of Planning
Mr. Fred W. Tuemmler
(Alternate) - Mr. William C. Burrage

Arlington County Planning Commission
Planning Engineer
Mr. C. L. Kinnier

Messrs. Brookfield, Gross, Gutheim and R. M. Watkins were members of the joint committee that helped draft the National Capital Planning Act of 1952.

INFORMATION FOR MEETING DATE -- Analysis of meeting dates of the various boards and commissions to which members of the Regional Planning Council belong shows that Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday are almost hopeless. Mr. Latimer's Board of Commissioners meets all day Friday, and Mr. Gross' Planning Commission (Arlington) meets on alternate Monday afternoons. Recommendation: that RPC schedule its meetings on Mondays so as not to conflict with Arlington Planning Commission, nor to be the same week as the NCPC meetings.

December 12, 1952

MASTER PLAN, SOLDIERS' HOME
Explained by S. E. Sanders
and discussion with members of the
Commission

I will probably better put the plans on the board and I will put the model in the center of the table here so that you can see it, oriented north and south. The scale of that is 200 feet to the inch. The contour intervals are five feet. We made a very thorough investigation into the probable future population demand on the Home and the total figure of the ultimate population is 6,500. At the presen time there are, including hospital and domiciliary buildings, about 1800. There will be a large increase in population and it is necessary, therefore, to provide quite a large domiciliary group and quite a large hospital; 5,000 men for the former and 1500 for the latter.

The main requirement in each of these groups is to house these men in buildings that can be connected so that they will not have to go outdoors in going from their rooms to the various facilities, like eating and recreation, since they are all quite old; the average age is 65.7 years and the main requirement is to house them in buildings which can all be connected. So in order to distribute the population and get as much open area as possible, we strung the new buildings out along this ridge that runs north and south.

The present domiciliary building that is being finished is in the center, right here (indicating); so we connected directly across to a new building here with a tunnel and a bridge above grade so that cars can go below it. Then this unit (indicating) will hold about 1100 men; another unit 1100, and one 850.

We propose to carry the units to the same height,-seven stories on the front and eight at the back, and leave the ground open between the wings, except for this portion here (indicating in two places) where there will be two-story buildings that will have recreation and dining room facilities. The dining room in this unit will accommodate 2200 men.

We have provided for balconies, and back of those balcony areas and west of the central corridor in the head house we will have day-rooms. Thus the men can look out into open park areas that we have provided on the west side; it has called for a little different type of architecture from the domiciliary buildings, since the balconies call for strong horizontal lines. There will be a balcony on each floor. There are balconies on some of the buildings now and the men use and enjoy them. There are walks planned leading to street car and bus routes, and between the Administration building and the domiciliary. Then there are recreation areas for games, such as tennis, croquet, shuffleboard.

The only buildings we plan to keep in the area are the Anderson Cottage, which was the summer home of Presidents in the early days, and the Grant Building, now used for a dining room. We plan to remodel that building into an Administration Building...It is planned to dispose of the old original Scott Building, built in 1851, and is thus 100 years old. There is a Scott Annex running back of the old building. In those two buildings live 222 men and it has been found that it would cost half a million dollars to put those buildings into good condition so that they would be livable. This is the first building on the grounds

All this development is in the north half of the grounds,-on 320 acres of the original 500. The new District of Columbia Medical Center will be at the south end of the grounds.

EXHIBIT B

No library building is planned, at least for the present. The library is in the Administration Building.

All plans for roads have been discussed with the National Capital Planning Commission and approved by them.

We have provided parking areas for the staff in the back with access directly to the service yard, and space for visitors' cars, which are few. There will be some residences on the west side, occupied by families of the staff.

There are several bandstands on the grounds. There is a good Band and they play several times a week.

This (indicating) is the Nurses Home, two-stories in elevation and is below the level of the terrace in this area. You can see the City of Washington from this location.

I believe that fairly covers the general lay-out. If you are interested to see some of these drawings that show the analysis that we made on determining the location of the roads and the different facilities, we will be glad to show them. The roof elevation of the new buildings will be the same as the old buildings. They are within the 90-foot zoning height allowed in the area.

Thereupon the members of the Commission discussed the Master Plan. Prof. Hudnut, Prof. Belluschi, and Mr. Peets criticized in particular the high density of the units, pointing out that in an area where there is so much land the several thousand veterans should not be made to live so closely together, depriving them of the chance to enjoy grass and trees near their rooms.

Mr. Sanders said that to spread out dormitory facilities means also spreading out other facilities, such as the dining room; in case of rain the men would get wet. Thus a head-house has been planned with corridors leading to several facilities.

Prof. Belluschi said: "This may be good, but it can be magnified out of proportion. At Harvard University the extent that people have to walk from one building to another is tremendous, but you don't hear complaints about it and you don't hear complaints about 90% of the universities where you really have to go out of doors. There are young people but also some old professors. But I think you can exaggerate this.

I think that the argument of utilities and economy of services and so on is a strong one but it also can be stretched. Some sort of compromise, as Mr. Peets

suggested, to decentralize and make use of some of the grounds nearby, would not give such a great concentration; and if you open the courts a little more you vary a bit the rendition of those wings. At first glance the design impresses me unfavorably. I do not know how Dean Hudnut feels about it."

Professor Hudnut said: "I am not convinced that this concentration is necessary at all. I do not follow your argument, Mr. Sanders, anywhere. It is cruel beyond words, to place so many men in such a small area.

Mr. Sanders replied, "The density of population is less than in the city."

Professor Hudnut said, "That is true. You have here, however, 5,000 old men looking out on that court just because you want to save a little trouble in your management. There is no sense of proportion. These people are living here. It is not like living in a hotel where people are for a day or two." Because the density is high in the city is not reason for making it bad here.

Mr. Sanders replied, " I figures the next which would be included in this area; it came to 60 persons per acre."

Professor Hudnut said, "Those figures mean nothing. You have only to look at the design to see how bad it is,--people six and seven stories high crowded in those impossible corridors, like skyscraper housing, and around those narrow courts, when you have all that land to give them beauty and humanity and freedom; you are not thinking about that, but rather or administration and/economics.

Mr. Biddle remarked, "That is what worries me. I live in New York City. There are plenty of men over 70 years of age that spend two hours a day commuting, or that will go from Brooklyn to New York twice a day for meals. So I don't see under those circumstances why that age limit precludes them from walking a few hundred yards."

Mr. Sanders replied, "A lot of those men are at the Home because they have had some injury in war.

Mr. Biddle said, "That is why I was asking for the reason why you say they want to go down town; yet would object to walking a short distance for meals."

Mr. Sanders remarked that to change this building scheme would disconnect the feeding operations; also administration. "All their troubles and all their money matters are settled right here (pointing to the headhouse)".

Mr. Riddle asked, "How often a week would they go there?" and Mr. Sanders replied, "Once a week."

Professor Hudnut urged a restudy of the design and a regrouping of the units as proposed. It would be possible to use narrow, rambling buildings, rather than high concentrated buildings.

Professor Belluschi said, "There should be more articulation in those units. They could be freed and relocated. I think the plan could be improved within the limits of practical considerations. It is worth studying. After all, 5,000 people is quite a large number and it is unfair to them to herd them like cattle. You may be committed to this "finger plan," but there are other ways to do the project and come out with something that is much more attractive and just as economical."

The Commission asked Mr. Peets to draft a report to be sent to Colonel McCutchen. This he did. A copy of the draft was sent to each member of the Commission and approved. The report was sent to Col. McCutchen, accordingly. (See Exhibit C)

Exhibit B

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington D. C.

January 14, 1953

Dear Colonel McCutchen:

I am writing to give you this Commission's comments on the plans for the Soldiers' Home, presented to us December 12, 1952.

1. We heartily commend the policy of preparing master plans; as a schematic layout, we like the proposed plan for the development of the Home.

With a plan like this one, revised from time to time, each new construction can be studied as part of an over-all organization. The members of the Commission thought the general plan was competently studied. We were impressed by the planner's analysis of the problem and by his handling of the practical elements. It should be noted, however, that a schematic plan inevitably emphasizes and simplifies the practical arrangements, while tending to leave the architectural amenities for future designers to work out. It must be anticipated that in this process corresponding adjustments in the servicing provisions will have to be made. We are confident that the professional skill exhibited in this plan will provide satisfactorily the adjustments required by such changes as those we are recommending.

The competent handling of the landscape architecture of the design should be mentioned. The studies for walks, terraces, recreation and planting show unusual imagination and understanding.

2. The proposed domiciliary construction seems excessively concentrated; greated differentiation and partial dispersion are recommended.

While we recognize that a compact grouping of the housing has advantages not only for servicing but also in such matters as easy access, by the members, to centrall recreation facilities, we feel that there are important negative factors to be considered. The morale or group feeling of such an institution must be considered very seriously--and over-crowding usually diminished good feeling. A hotel is an excellent place to stay for a week but not many of us would enjoy looking forward to spending the rest of our lives in one. Despite any minor architectural modifications that may be made, we believe that the proposed concentration of housing would create a huge impersonal institution which only ironically could be called a "home" for human beings.

We recommend, therefore, that a very serious effort be made to find new housing sites. As one possibility we suggest the land south-west of the building now under construction; it is occupied in part by officers' homes but we feel that housing for the members could be considered a more important use. Another site might be found in the vicinity of the golf course. For purposes of access and servicing this group could perhaps be related to the hospital buildings.

EXHIBIT C

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington D. C.

January 14, 1932

Dear Colonel Wetherbee:

I am writing to give you this Commission's comments on the plans for the Soldiers' Home, presented to us December 14, 1932.

1. We heartily commend the policy of preparing master plans; in a community like Washington, we like the purpose plan for the development of the whole.

With a plan like this one, revised from time to time, each new construction can be studied as part of an over-all organization. The members of the Commission thought the general plan was competently studied. We were impressed by the planner's analysis of the problem and by his handling of the practical elements. It should be noted, however, that a coherent plan inevitably emphasizes and simplifies the precisional arrangements, while leaving to leave the ornithological amenities for future designers to work out. It must be anticipated that in this process correspondingly adjustments to the surviving provisions will have to be made. We are confident that the professional skill exhibited in this plan will provide satisfactorily for adjustments rendered by such changes as these may be necessary.

The competent handling of the landscape architecture of the design should be mentioned. The studies for walks, terraces, recreation and planting show unusual investigation and understanding.

2. The proposed subsidiary construction seems eminently conservative; grouped dispensaries and partial dispersion are recommended.

While we recognize that a compact grouping of the housing has advantages not only for servicing but also in such matters as easy access, by the nurses, to central recreation facilities, we feel that there are important negative factors to be considered. The morale or group feeling of such an institution must be considered very seriously--and over-crowding usually diminishes good feeling. A hotel is an excellent place to stay for a week but not many of us would enjoy looking forward to spending the rest of our lives in one. Despite any minor architectural modifications that may be made, we believe that the proposed overcrowding of housing would create a type of institution which only ironically could be called a "home" for human beings.

We recommend, therefore, that a very serious effort be made to find new housing sites. As one possibility we suggest the land to the west of the building now under construction; it is occupied in part by officers' horses but we feel that housing for the nurses could be contained a more important use. Another site might be found in the vicinity of the golf course. For purposes of access and servicing this group could perhaps be replaced to the hospital buildings.

3. 3. There should be greater freedom in the building plans, and better expression of their residential character.

Though admitting the practical advantages of the headhouse-and-wings type of building and also its orderliness in large groupings, we believe that a considerably freer disposition of the building masses would be possible. In any case an effort should be made to keep the future buildings two or more stories lower than the high building now being completed, making the latter the dominant structure of the entire development. All will agree, too, that such cut-in courts as are necessary should be as wide as is practicable and that long views from the rooms are desirable. Orientation is also important; we think that courts opening to the south or south-west pick up more summer breezes than an easterly exposure does.

We like the long balconies proposed for future buildings; they are reminiscent of garrison barracks with their open galleries, as used in some of the present buildings of the Home. This is the kind of thing that has human scale, relates the structures to the ground, and expresses comfort and relaxation.

4. The service group is excellently organized but might be less rigid in plan.

This group of buildings will be very conspicuous in a view of the Home from the air and will also be seen from the higher residential rooms. Without exaggerating the importance of this matter, consideration might be given to "breaking" the plan by a moderate difference in orientation (introducing an angle in the alighment) between the north and south portions of the group, or by other means which will suggest themselves to the designer. We assume that a few trees will be planted inside the group.

5. Some of the old buildings should be preserved.

We understand that present plans propose the demolition, at future dates, of many old buildings. Most of these, unquestionably, will have outlived their usefulness and their sites may advantageously be put to other uses. We are quite sure, however, that a few of the structures now scheduled for future demolition have sufficient sentimental and aesthetic value to warrant their preservation. To perform its service effectively, a large institution must create in the operating staff, in the people it serves, and in the public a sense of loyalty and pride. To produce this feeling, an old institution depends largely on its historic background including the famous names or events connected with it, as well as the long period of its growth and service.

Soldiers' Home is unusually fortunate in having important architectural memorials dating from the time of its founding, such as the Scott Building. If preserved, it could appropriately become a museum or a clubhouse.

We hope that the authorities of the Home, before they schedule demolitions, will consult with the National Trust for

3. There should be greater freedom in the building plans, and better expression of their residential character.

Though enabling the practical advantages of the headhouse-and-wings type of building and also its underlying in large groupings, we believe that a considerably freer disposition of the building masses would be possible. In any case an effort should be made to keep the future buildings two or more stories lower than the High building now being completed, making the latter the dominant structure of the entire development. All will agree, too, that such out-in courts as are necessary should be as wide as is practicable and that long views from the rooms are desirable. Orientation is also important; we think that courts opening to the north or south-west pick up more summer breezes than an easterly exposure does.

We like the long balconies proposed for future buildings; they are reminiscent of garrison barracks with their open galleries, as used in some of the present buildings of the Home. This is the kind of thing that has human scale, relates the structures to the ground, and expresses comfort and relaxation.

4. The service group is excellently organized but might be less rigid in plan.

This group of buildings will be very conspicuous in a view of the Home from the air and will also be seen from the higher residential rooms. Without exaggerating the importance of this matter, consideration might be given to "breaking" the plan by a moderate difference in orientation (introducing an angle in the alignment) between the north and south portions of the group, or by other means which will suggest themselves to the designer. We assume that a few trees will be planted inside the group.

5. Some of the old buildings should be preserved.

We understand that reasons other than purpose like demolition, at future dates, of many old buildings. Most of these, undoubtedly, will have outlived their usefulness and their sites may advantageously be put to other uses. We are quite sure, however, that a few of the structures now scheduled for future demolition have sufficient sentimental and aesthetic value to warrant their preservation. To perform its service effectively, a large institution must create in the oppressing staff, in the people it serves, and in the public a sense of loyalty and pride. To produce this feeling, an old institution depends largely on its historic background including the famous names or events connected with it, as well as the long period of its growth and service.

Soldiers' Home is unusually fortunate in having important architectural memorials dating from the time of the founding, such as the South Building. If preserved, it could appropriately become a museum or a clubhouse.

We hope that the authorities of the Home, before they consider demolitions, will consult with the Cabinet Fund for

Historic Preservation, the Society of Architectural Historians and local historical societies. This Commission, if its assistance is desired, will gladly participate in such consultations.

Let me thank you again for giving us the opportunity to discuss the plans with you and to hear Mr. Sanders' explanation of them. I am sure that your long-range approach will give us, in the course of time, a group of buildings of which we can all be proud.

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Colonel Alan J. McCutchen
District Engineer
Corps of Engineers
1st & Douglas Streets, N. W.
Washington, D. C.

Discussion taken from transcript of Meeting of December 12, 1952

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Do you want to make the presentation, Colonel?

COLONEL McCUTCHEN: Just a brief one. The next project that we would like to submit to the Commission is the Little Falls Project, a part of the Washington Aqueduct. This project is a portion of the development for the expansion of the water supply facilities for the city. It is being submitted to the Commission because of the concern of the Commission over the Potomac River Basin in the vicinity of Washington and also its concern over the approaches to Washington since the one branch of the Memorial Highway will extend past this structure leading into the city. I would like to call on Mr. Schmitt who is Chief of the Washington Aqueduct to make the presentation to us.

MR. SCHMITT: The reason for this project is that we have two 9-foot conduits that come down from Great Falls, Maryland to the District of Columbia to the National Capital and environs. The capacity of those conduits has been reached so we need an additional pumping station, and the only source of water is the Potomac River. The conduit could be paralleled but we did not want to put all of our eggs in one basket. So the site of an old dam there -- this is an old rock-filled dam -- was selected which has a pool at elevation 40 above sea level. It was selected as s site to get the water. Therefore, we have a totally different source of water supply which could supply the entire city, exclusive of the conduits which are 14 miles up at Great Falls. So this is the site we have picked. There will be a permanent masonry dam here to replace this old loose rock-fill dam because we cannot get it -- ice and water floods will take it out. Then we will build a pumping station. From that the water will go through a tunnel and up through a shaft into an existing reservoir, called the

Discussion taken from transcript of Meeting of December 15, 1952

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Do you want to make the presentation, Colonel?

COLONEL MCDONOUGH: Just a brief one. The next project that we would like to submit to the Commission is the Little Falls Project, a part of the Washington Aqueduct. This project is a portion of the development for the expansion of the water supply facilities for the city. It is being submitted to the Commission because of the concern of the Commission over the Potomac River Basin in the vicinity of Washington and also its concern over the approaches to Washington since the one branch of the Memorial Highway will extend past this structure leading into the city. I would like to call on Mr. Schmidt who is Chief of the Washington Aqueduct to make the presentation to us.

MR. SCHMIDT: The reason for this project is that we have two 9-foot conduits that come down from Great Falls, Maryland to the Dividing of Columbia to the National Capital and environs. The capacity of those conduits has been reached so we need an additional pumping station, and the only source of water is the Potomac River. The conduit could be paralleled but we did not want to put all of our eggs in one basket. So the site of an old dam there -- this is an old rock-filled dam -- was selected which has a pool at elevation 40 above sea level. It was selected as a site to get the water. Therefore, we have a totally different source of water supply which could supply the entire city, exclusive of the conduits which are 14 miles up at Great Falls. So this is the site we have picked. There will be a permanent masonry dam here to replace this old loose rock-fill dam because we cannot get it -- ice and water floods will take it out. Then we will build a pumping station. From that the water will go through a tunnel and up through a shaft into an existing reservoir, called the

Dalecarlia Reservoir. It is really a very convenient location. The dam is at a good elevation above sea level and the pumping station is handy and the lake for our filtration facilities is also very convenient, so that according to a document published by the Congress, this is the approved location for a dam and pumping station and a tunnel. Of course, it is only the pumping station that really causes any consideration in the matter. We have been working on this proposition for some time and made half a dozen or more sketches and finally evolved this particular location and design. This point is about a mile upstream from the District of Columbia line in Maryland. These two just show the plan as finally developed. We had a big, massive building here and nothing on the other side so this plan as developed serves all the functional needs of the pumping station and the tunnel. In this area there will be pumps. Here will be a screen and in this area the substation. The current comes in at 33,000 volts and is reduced down to 4160 volts in these two buildings here on the bridge. We have tried to keep the shape and the mass of the whole composition down to a reasonable basis. As the Colonel mentioned, this is part of the George Washington Memorial Parkway. We have a tentative approval of the Park Service to locate our station there. We also will have to buy some property which will in the future be turned over to the Park Service. This is to represent the east-bound road on the George Washington Memorial Parkway and on the upper level the west-bound road. Due to the slope of the land running up to MacArthur Boulevard, the Public Roads Administration has separated these two roads by some 350 -- by some 35 or 40 feet, the only way they could get through. So we have accepted those plans as they presented them to us and developed our composition in that particular area. This particular view is a graphic plan and elevation view of that perspective. We are proposing a single prestressed concrete arch which we think has a very pretty effect

over the canal which is going to be maintained by the National Park Service. They run barge trips up and nature studies and take tourists up and down the canal. This is the lower road. This is the upper road. That is a street car track and MacArthur Boulevard is up the hill here further. The pumps are in the deep part of the station and the shallower parts are the screens and bar racks. These are switch gears which operate from the current that comes through these transformers from the power company supply at this point. The reason for the block nature of the building, and I don't think it is unattractive, is that floods can rise to a maximum of some 40 feet or more when they come down the river. All of this area through here would be flooded up to an area in here. That is the area of maximum predicted flood. So this structure had to be built without a single hole in it to protect all the pumping equipment. That is what dictated the basic design that we have presented. The same is true here. So that when floods come, this can still come and continue to operate without any interference from nature. That is the general perspective of the whole project in space.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I think this is a very attractive scheme and a more attractive presentation. I think it is fine.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Yes. I think it is a very attractive design.

MR. SCHMITT: Don't blame me. That is our architect who did that. But we worked with him in the physical requirements and he took them and put them in first-class shape.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I am glad to learn we have that second supply of water. We should have it in the city. I think it is wise.

MR. SCHMITT: In point of fact, the conduits bring down about 216 million gallons of water and the maximum consumption during the summer has been 243. Our existing pumping station is too small and too poorly located to do what the future requires. So this was almost a must.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: In this you can get any amount of water for the future no matter what the population of the city may be.

MR. SCHMITT: That is estimated at over 500 million gallons of pumping capacity.

MR. SMITH: Practically the low flow of the river.

MR. HUDNUT: May I ask one question?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Certainly.

MR. HUDNUT: Is the arch form of the bridge dictated by structural considerations or by esthetic ones?

MR. SCHMITT: A little of both. In the first place, when the design started, we had a flat bridge across there with three or four piers which is very common and ordinary and the usual method of building a bridge. After we worked on it a while, the architect came up with the idea of a pre-stressed concrete bridge. They build them up to 390 feet long, single span, in Europe.

MR. BELLUSCHI: That is the structural shape of prostressed.

MR. HUDNUT: I see.

MR. SCHMITT: I thought the absence of pier and arch form here would make an attractive setting connecting the two parts of the composition.

MR. CAEMMERER: Mr. Finley, may I ask a question?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Certainly.

MR. CAEMMERER: What is the height of the dam?

MR. SCHMITT: The dam will be the same height as the existing dam.

MR. CAEMMERER: How high is that?

MR. SCHMITT: Which is elevation 40 above sea-level — elevation 40 above mean low water. Actually, 39.

MR. CAEMMERER: You are not creating a basin?

MR. SCHMITT: We aren't going to change that pool up above because then we run into trouble with the Park service and their recreational facilities

and things of that kind, so that we have maintained the existing conditions there. Ultimately, that old dam will all wash out.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Mr. Peets, have you any questions?

MR. PEETS: No.

MR. SCHMITT: We are just at an opportune time to bring these plans before you because we have a firm of architects-engineers who are now designing this and they are just about prepared to go ahead with the design of the structure, so that whatever action or comments you make, we hope you approve it; that is what we propose.

MR. BELLUSCHI: As I said, I think it is very nice. I bring out a very minor point. But is this bulge here necessary? Is that by reason of -- that piece, I take it, indicates some stairs. You probably don't know what to use to balance it. But going up beyond the line, is that somewhat poetic license?

MR. SCHMITT: There are two or three planning or practical considerations concerned with that. This stairway takes up to the roof level and as shown here, this whole floor is open; a crane operates up and down there. This is occupied by switch gear so this takes up to the ventilators on the roof which is a flat-deck roof. There will be motors operating the ventilators because tremendous heat is given off by the pumps and we need that protection. I think there are 15 or 20 ventilators and holes in the roof that will operate. The roof level is about in there and this merely takes us up and gets us through that wall.

MR. PEETS: This is not a criticism but I was just noticing that height. I have the impression that the building at the right is more attractive than the building at the left.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Yes.

MR. PEETS: I was wondering why. Do you feel that?

MR. BELLUSCHI: Yes; but there is a reason for it; therefore, I am satisfied.

MR. PEETS: Handled in the right way.

MR. SCHMITT: There is a circular stairway there.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Are there any other questions, gentlemen?

MR. HUDNUT: I think it is very attractive, but I should prefer a three-span bridge, two piers.

MR. SCHMITT: This is about 220-foot span. If you divided them into that, you would have somewhere around 70-80 foot span in there which we feel would be objectionable. The other answer is that there is a tow path here on which they still use a mule to take a barge up and down. It is only really sidewalk space so that if we built a pier here we would have to put it behind the tow path so that the mule and barge can all go on back. That is one of the requirements outside of trying to suit you gentlemen was to sell the idea to the Park Service because we are going to move into the area and occupy some of the land for a necessary public utility so that if they like the idea of a single bridge very much, well, all to the good.

MR. HUDNUT: I don't object to it. I think it is very sweet. But I just wanted to put it in for the record.

MR. PEETS: It is a different scale.

MR. HUDNUT: It is out of scale. It has a different feeling. It is like a sweet gentlewoman introduced to a couple of soldiers.

MR. BELLUSCHI: What's wrong with that?

MR. HUDNUT: If you had said, two gentlewomen, I would say, all right.

MR. PEETS: The renderer has very tactfully exhibited the entire composition but omitting some of the trees that will undoubtedly be there.

MR. SMITH: That is true.

MR. PEETS: And with more trees and with some Boston ivy planted —

MR. HUDNUT: By all means ivy.

MR. PEETS: It could be pulled together.

MR. SCHMITT: You are correct about it. The renderers took us too literally. This whole shore, for instance, is occupied with a rather dense growth of trees; but the land is low -- only a foot or two -- and a minimum freshet will flood this area so the Park Service gave us authority to clean out 300 feet below and 1000 feet above and make all that fill level with the tow path which will be about ten or fifteen. Later on they will put plantings and trees back on. So the bare appearance is a little interpretation on his part of the clearing we are going to make to do construction work. But it will be lined with trees in the future.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Thank you, Mr. Schmitt.

MR. SCHMITT: We will hear from you later about the action. Shall we leave the drawings for your consideration?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would you like them any further, gentlemen?

MR. HUDNUT: No.

MR. BIDDLE: They are beautiful renderings.

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

December 15, 1952

Dear Colonel McCutchen:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on December 12, 1952, were pleased to inspect the design which you submitted for the proposed Pumping Station at Little Falls.

The Commission of Fine Arts approved the design.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
David E. Finley,

Chairman.

Colonel Alan J. McCutchen,
District Engineer,
Corps of Engineers,
First & Douglas Streets, N. W.,
Washington D. C.

EXHIBIT D-1

The Commission of Fine Arts
7000 Interior Department Building,
Washington D. C.

December 15, 1932

Dear Colonel Lockwood:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting
on December 10, 1932, were pleased to approve the
design which you submitted for the proposed
Pumping Station at Little Falls.

The Commission of Fine Arts approved the design.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Secy.

David B. Finley,

Chairman.

Colonel Allen J. Lockwood,
District Engineer,
Corps of Engineers,
First & Douglas Streets, N. W.,
Washington D. C.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Will you proceed, Mr. Hunter?

MR. HUNTER: We would like to discuss with you this morning the murals in the Comptroller's suite in the GAO. As you recall, about a year ago we had some discussions with you on that same subject. We submitted to you names of certain artists. I believe, although the records do not show it, that you concurred in Michael Jamieson as the muralist for the panel in the big conference room. You then made a counter-proposal and gave us the names of four other artists which you would like for us to consider for the other mural. Only one of these artists is acceptable to the Government. I would prefer not to use him because of the type work that he does. We feel it is a little on the abstract side. So we came back this morning with three others, three other names that we would like for you to give consideration to if you would be so inclined to do so.

MR. BIDDLE: May I ask again, what was the character of this second one that you mentioned? Where was it?

MR. HUNTER: The second one, the smaller of the two, would be in the Comptroller General's private office, or his outer office from his private office.

MR. BIDDLE: The one for which you are submitting names now.

MR. HUNTER: Yes, sir; we have submitted names of alternates in case Mr. Mitchell Jamieson was tied up so that if he was tied up we could get him for panel 2, the Jamieson panel or the one in the Comptroller General's private office, we had Jamieson. As alternate, Barry Faulkner of Washington. For panel one, the larger of the two panels, the one in the conference room, we submit John Chapman Lewis, also of Washington, and as an alternate, John Allan Maxwell of New York City.

Mr. Biddle: Which are the names submitted for that, do you remember?

DISCUSSION RE NEEDS FOR MANUAL ACCOUNTING DEVICE

CHAIRMAN FINCH: Will you proceed, Mr. Hunter?

MR. HUNTER: We would like to discuss with you this morning the needs in the Comptroller's suite in the CAC. As you recall, about a year ago we had some discussions with you on this same subject. As submitted to you those of certain exhibits. I believe, although the records do not show it, that you concurred in Colonel Dawson as the material for the panel in the big conference room. The other was a counter-proposal and gave me the names of four other exhibits which you would like for me to consider for the other panel. Only one of those exhibits is acceptable to the Government. I would prefer not to use him because of the type work that he does. We feel it is a little on the abstract side. So we came back this morning with three others, three other names that we would like for you to give consideration to if you would be inclined to do so.

MR. DUDDIE: May I ask again, what was the circumstance of this second one that you mentioned? There was --

MR. HUNTER: The second one, the auditor of the two, would be in the Comptroller General's parents office, or his other duties from his primary office.

MR. DUDDIE: The one for which you are consulting counsel now.

MR. HUNTER: Yes, sir; he has quantities items of clearances in case Mr. Mitchell testified was also that if you are like up we could get to panel 3, the Lamison panel or five one in the Comptroller General's private office, we had discussed. As alternate, Army Auditor. And panel one, the large of the two panels, six one in the conference room, we Lamison Items, also of Washington, and in my following, John Quinn General of Law Dept Dept.

MR. DUDDIE: What are the names included now, on the previous

MR. HUNTER: Yes; I have them here: Anton Refregier; Ben Shaun; Peppino Mangravite; H. Varnum Poor.

MR. BIDDLE: Have you set forth —

MR. HUNTER: I am not in position to discuss that; I would rather not.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Were all four of the men unacceptable?

MR. HUNTER: One of them is acceptable as far as the clearance goes, but Mr. Persina and I prefer not to use them bedause we feel that his work is more in the abstract type.

MR. BIDDLE: Did you mention him? Are you at liberty to do that?

MR. HUNTER: I would rather not call the names off, if it is agreeable to you?

MR. BIDDLE: The only reason I asked that was out of curiosity because I know the work of all four of those very well and one of them I would say would be on the completely traditional realistic and acceptable side in the sense that he is, that he has done many murals in Washington and elsewhere. What were the names again? Shaun, Refregier, Poor, and Mangravite — two of those have done work along the completely traditional and many murals and none of the four are abstract at all. Refregier has done some abstract work.

MR. HUNTER: Rather than confuse the issue, Mr. Biddle, and rather than put here — rather than point fingers at any one person, if you consider just forgetting those four and start over, I think that would be the best way to handle it, Mr. Chairman, if you agree to that.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Do all of you agree? There are some very good painters among those four, of course.

MR. BELLUSCHI: It is a very important point to agree or disagree on, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BIDDLE: I thought all we could do was to make suggestions which don't have to be accepted.

MR. BELLUSCHI: But now they reject and come back for another.

MR. HUNTER: We come back and resubmit three other names and ask for formal approval of Jamieson and submit three other names.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think that is correct and we can say whether or not we would approve the three that you submit.

MR. BIDDLE: Was there any way we could see the photographs of the work of the men that you recommended?

MR. HUNTER: Chris, do you have any background data on those? You have historical data, I know.

MR. PERSINA: I have historical data but no pictorial.

MR. HUNTER: Let's take the first of three, these three, and give Mr. Biddle a brief of what you have on him: John Chapman Lewis first.

MR. PERSINA: John Chapman Lewis graduated from the Corcoran School of Fine Arts; Instructor, Corcoran School of Fine Arts, 1949-1950. After serving in the United States Navy. Under the heading of National Recognition: Included in the list of young American artists selected by Life Magazine and Metropolitan Museum of Fine Arts, New York, under the title of American Painting Today. He was accepted to exhibit in the following museums: Metropolitan Museum, Corcoran Museum, Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, University of Maryland, Baltimore Museum of Fine Arts. He received the Lewis Comfort Tiffany contemporary scholarship in 1950. Received first awards in American regional exhibits in New Orleans, Atlanta, and Baltimore.

MR. HUNTER: How about Maxwell.

MR. PERSINA: John Howard Maxwell. He was born in Roanoke, Virginia, 1904. He is also a graduate of the Corcoran Art School, Art Students' League; studied under George Loucks, Vincent DuMond, George Britt, and Joseph Pinelli.

MR. HUNTER: Barry Faulkner.

MR. PERSINA: Barry Faulkner? I have his record in the office.

MR. BIDDLE: I know his work very well.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We know his work. He has worked at the Archives Building. Do you know the work of these other two men?

MR. BIDDLE: I would have to see a reproduction of the work before I would feel justified in making any comment on them.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: You don't have any photographs of any work.

MR. HUNTER: Don't have any photographs at all?

MR. PERSINA: No, sir.

MR. HUNTER: Chris, they know Mr. Faulkner, would you consider using Mr. Faulkner as number one, first choice on panel number one so we could go ahead? We are up against a time limit. The Comptroller General is very anxious to get going. We have postponed it now for some time to see if we could rake up the funds to do it. We find we have a few thousand dollars we can do it with so the Commissioner has asked me to come over here today and come to some agreement so we can go ahead immediately on these murals.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: How is the work to be done? Is it to be on canvas?

MR. HUNTER: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Is there any reason why it could not be done later even if the Comptroller General is using the room?

MR. HUNTER: Could, but he wants to get it up to finish the decoration of his room.

MR. PEETS: The material about these gentlemen is not available in Washington? After all, there are several hours left in the day.

MR. PERSINA: I would presume, Mr. Peets, that the Commission had full knowledge of the qualifications of these men. I mean, they are all noted individuals. It should not be our obligation, I would say, to furnish that information.

MR. BELLUSCHI: These are young fellows. Chapman Lewis is a young person. While we know all the others, perhaps, this Chapman Lewis is, as I say, a young person.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I would think we have to take some time to look into their qualifications.

MR. PERSINA: Advisable, yes, sir.

MR. BIDDLE: The data you gave about him places him in a category as an easel painter but that would not necessarily have mush to do with mural qualifications. That is the reason before passing any personal judgment I would like to see simply the mural side of his work. I am not interested in the easel because there is no question about it that he has a very professional standard, would have as an easel painter, method and so forth and so on.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Are there any mural paintings by either of these men in Washington that we could see?

MR. PERSINA: Well, except Jamieson, as you know.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Lewis Chapman and Maxwell. Could you get some information by the January meeting?

MR. BIDDLE: I could probably get it in a few days. It would be very hard for me to see anything else unless I had seen some. I think the Commission ought to see some examples of their work before the Commission as a whole has an opinion on it, don't you?

MR. BELLUSCHI: Just a question of being in a hurry all the time. It has been there for a ling time.

MR. BIDDLE: Chances are it is a six months' job.

MR. HUNTER: May I make this suggestion, Mr. Chairman? In view of the fact that you know Jamieson, could we have approval for him on panel number two, in the private office?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: He was recommended, wasn't he?

MR. PERSINA: I would like to make a correction there. He was selected for the conference room.

MR. HUNTER: Panel two is the conference room. Excuse me; could we go ahead on that basis?

MR. BIDDLE: He was recommended

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: He was recommended by the Commission.

MR. BIDDLE: Surely.

MR. HUNTER: We did not have that in writing and I wanted to be sure we were clear on it.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think the Commission would be very happy to have you go ahead.

MR. HUNTER: To avoid further delay, could we shift Barry Faulkner to number one spot and let Maxwell and Lewis be alternates in case we could not form a contract with Faulkner or Jamieson.

MR. PEETS: Is that quite fair to these two young fellows? One of them might be an excellent painter.

MR. BIDDLE: I would like to give the whole thing some consideration.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I think so. This business of rushing —

MR. HUNTER: You know what we are up against. When the Comptroller General says he wants it, it is up to us to try to get it.

MR. BELLUSCHI: It is a question of decision, rushing a decision for expediency.

MR. BIDDLE: This is over a year ago that we submitted names.

MR. HUNTER: Until recently we did not know how we stood financially so we put it off until we knew the dollars we had to put in it.

MR. BIDDLE: You can take over a year to make up your minds, then you can give us a week or two.

MR. HUNTER: May we then go ahead on panel number two which is the big

panel for Mr. Jamieson? I would like to get him in next week if we can get going on that.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Is that agreeable?

MR. BIDDLE: We have recommended him already.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Certainly there is no reason not to do that. Mr. Caemmerer, would you write a letter? Or would you like me to write a letter on that?

MR. PERSINA: May I make this suggestion? I will go to the trouble to dig up any examples of these other two men if you wish.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Will you do that? Then you could send it to Mr. Caemmerer to send it to Mr. Biddle.

MR. HUNTER: Could we expect approval on one of those two, do you think, before the next meeting, with Mr. Biddle's recommendations?

MR. BIDDLE: Ask the Chairman?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I do not think the Commission should be asked to do that. You have had a year in which to consider these men and I think the other members of the Commission could not give their decision without seeing the representations of the work. This is not a way to present the matter.

MR. PERSINA: No, indeed. We are glad to trust Mr. Biddle's judgment but I think you also would like to have the Commission pass on it, don't you?

MR. BIDDLE: I think the Commission ought to pass on it, don't you?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: If we had been dilatory in making recommendations, we would try to rush it but otherwise I think we will have a meeting in January and we will make a recommendation then.

MR. HUNTER: May I withdraw that from the record and forget the whole thing.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: All right. The reason I say that is this. We are constantly faced with a situation where you want a decision before the next meeting and we are not able to give that.

MR. HUNTER: We will go ahead and probably that will pacify the Comptroller General for the time being, with the understanding that we will get some decision on these other two men, or other three, actually: Faulkner, Lewis and Maxwell. Then you will send to Mr. Finley some reproduction of the murals with these two men.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Or rather, send them to Mr. Caemmerer and also to Mr. Biddle.

MR. BIDDLE: We know Barry Faulkner.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We know his work in the Archives Building.

MR. BIDDLE: Was there any other information for the moment about those other two panels on that building we talked about with the idea that there might be funds saved for them?

MR. PERSINA: That is what Mr. Hunter was prepared to discuss if you brought that question up.

MR. HUNTER: We still are not clear out of the woods on financing the project. We have two other small contracts running over there, new clean-up contracts for additional things of that nature.

MR. BIDDLE: When do you think you might know that for a guess?

MR. HUNTER: We ought to know in the next three or four months exactly where we stand on that.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Thank you, gentlemen.

C O P Y

October 10, 1952

COPY - 11/13/52

Hon. Charles R. Howell
House of Representatives
Washington 25, D. C.

My dear Mr. Howell:

This will acknowledge your letter dated September 26 in which you request our comments regarding an all-weather cover for the Carter Barron Amphitheater in Rock Creek Park with particular reference to the clipping from the Washington Post of August 24, 1952. We are returning the newspaper clipping to you.

You are familiar with the origin of this Amphitheater project and the difficulty of adjusting the cost to the minimum specifications as approved by the Sesquicentennial Commission. In order to bring the cost of the construction within the limits of the funds available, certain features were dispensed with; but we believe that the results have been generally acceptable to the public and that the structure compares favorably with similar structures in other parts of the country.

The Sesquicentennial Commission, at the time it allocated $200,000 for the completion of the Amphitheater, did not include the erection of an all-weather cover for that structure. The estimated cost of such a project, based on preliminary estimates, would be in the neighborhood of $100,000. The only funds available for the construction of a covering for the Amphitheater is money appropriated to the Sesquicentennial Commission; therefore, it is the concensus of this office that the initiation of such a project should emanate from that Commission. It may be that the Commission is doubtful of the advisability of changing the basic design of an outdoor amphitheater by erecting an all-weather cover over the structure. It must be recalled, however, that the Amphitheater was designed as an open structure at the specific instruction of the Commission executives, to create an atmosphere in keeping with the spirit of the Sesquicentennial pageant "Faith of Our Fathers." There would appear to be merit in such a position since open amphitheaters at Manteo, North Carolina, and Williamsburg, Virginia, were used as a guide in the original design and, it was stressed, at that time (1949), that every effort should be made by the

EXHIBIT F

October 10, 1932

COPY - 11/13/32

Hon. Charles F. Howell
House of Representatives
Washington 25, D. C.

My dear Mr. Howell:

This will acknowledge your letter dated September 26 in which you request our comments regarding an all-weather cover for the Custer Barron Amphitheater in Rock Creek Park with particular reference to the clipping from the Washington Post of August 24, 1932. We are returning the newspaper clipping to you.

You are familiar with the origin of this amphitheater project and the difficulty of adjusting the cost to the minimum specifications as approved by the Municipal-Memorial Commission. In order to bring the cost of the construction within the limits of the funds available, certain features were dispensed with; but we believe that the results have been generally acceptable to the public and that the structure compares favorably with similar structures in other parts of the country.

The Municipal-Memorial Commission, at the time it allocated $200,000 for the completion of the Amphitheater, did not include the erection of an all-weather cover for that structure. The estimated cost of such a project, based on preliminary estimates, would be in the neighborhood of $500,000. The only funds available for the construction of a covering for the Amphitheater is money appropriated to this Municipal-Memorial Commission; therefore, it is the consensus of this office that the initiation of such a project should emanate from that Commission. It may be that the Commission is doubtful of the advisability of changing the basic design of an outdoor amphitheater by erecting an all-weather cover over the structure. It must be recalled, however, that the Amphitheater was designed as an open structure at the specific instruction of the Commission of Fine Arts, to create an atmosphere in keeping with the spirit of the Memorial pageant "Faith of Our Fathers." There would appear to be merit in such a position since open amphitheaters at Manteo, North Carolina, and Williamsburg, Virginia, were used as a guide in the original design and, to mention a few, at that time (1924), that every effort should be made by the

architects to retain the natural beauty of the site and particularly the stage setting and approaches. The open amphitheaters at Manteo and Williamsburg have been operated very successfully for approximately 15 years. It should not be lost sight of that the Carter Barron Amphitheater does embrace certain enclosed features, such as rain shelters and retractable curtains, and, we believe that is as far as we would be justified in proceeding at this time in view of the present fiscal policy of the Administration.

A very careful evaluation of this matter should be made in order that we do not confuse an open amphitheater and its sylvan surroundings with a conventional theater or opera house in a downtown area. In this connection, your attention is directed to H. J. Res. 349 and S. J. Res. 105, a companion bill, introduced in the first session of the 82nd Congress, that provided for the establishment of a National Art Commission and authorized the construction of a suitable theater and opera house as a National War Memorial in the Nation's Capital. The Department of the Interior, at your request, is now considering similar legislation that you are proposing for introduction in the new Congress. If such legislation should be enacted, the public would be afforded an opportunity to enjoy productions in a conventional theater or opera house as well as productions especially adapted to a sylvan outdoor theater.

Because of your personal interest in contributing to the cultural improvement of the Nation's Capital through artistic musical and theatrical presentations, I know that you will be pleased to learn that at least one reputable producer has proposed a three months program at the Carter Barron Amphitheater for the 1953 season that would not only include presentations of the highest cultural value, but would return revenues to the Government well in excess of operating costs.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Edward J. Kelly
Superintendent

Enclosure

WGHayward:ms

architects to retain the natural beauty of the site and particularly the stage setting and approaches. The open amphitheatre at Manteo and Williamsburg have been operated very successfully for approximately 15 years. It should not be lost sight of that the Outer Banks Amphitheater does encroach certain enclosed features, such as rain shelters and restrooms, and we believe that is as far as we would be justified in proceeding at this time in view of the present fiscal policy of the Administration.

A very careful evaluation of this matter should be made in order that we do not confuse an open amphitheater and its sylvan surroundings with a conventional theater or opera house in a downtown area. In this connection, your attention is directed to H. J. Res. 349 and S. J. Res. 105, a companion bill, introduced in the first session of the 83rd Congress, that provided for the establishment of a National Art Commission and authorized the construction of a suitable theater and opera house as a National War Memorial in the Nation's Capital. The Department of the Interior, as your request, is now considering similar legislation that you are proposing for introduction in the new Congress. If such legislation should be enacted, the public would be afforded an opportunity to enjoy productions in a conventional theater or opera house as well as productions especially adapted to a sylvan outdoor theater.

Because of your personal interest in contributing to the cultural improvement of the Nation's Capital through artistic musical and theatrical presentations, I know that you will be pleased to learn that at least one reputable producer has proposed a three months program at the Outer Banks Amphitheater for the 1953 season that would not only include presentations of the highest cultural value, but would return revenues to the Government well in excess of operating costs.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Edward J. Kelly
Superintendent

Enclosure

MSHayward:mc

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

December 12, 1952

Dear Mr. Howell:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting today, was glad to have the opportunity of considering the Bill which you propose to introduce in the next Congress for the purpose of establishing a National War Memorial Arts Commission. The Commission is in sympathy with the proposal to establish a War Memorial insofar as it will provide a building in which opera, symphony concerts, and ballet may be performed. They feel that the building should be confined to such use and should not be employed for the exhibition of the visual arts which are shown in the Government's museums.

The Commission also feels that, instead of the establishment of a Commission such as is proposed in your Bill, the erection and operation of the building should be placed under the direction of the Office of General Services. The Commission hopes that such a building may be erected in the near future and asked me to express its appreciation of the efforts which you and others are making towards this end.

As regards constructing a roof on the Carter Barron Amphitheater in Rock Creek Park, the Commission feels that it is not in a position at this time to express an opinion as to the desirability of constructing a roof on the Carter Barron Amphitheater. They will be glad to consider the matter and to express an opinion if and when a design for such a roof is submitted to the Commission by the National Capital Parks, which has responsibility for operating the amphitheater.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Honorable Charles R. Howell
House of Representatives
Washington D. C.

cc to: Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary, Commission of Fine Arts.

def/mfk

EXHIBIT G

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

December 17, 1932

Dear Mr. Howell:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting today, was glad to have the opportunity of considering the Bill which you propose to introduce in the next Congress for the purpose of establishing a National War Memorial Arts Commission. The Commission is in sympathy with the proposal to establish a War Memorial Theater as it will provide a building in which opera, symphony concerts, and ballet may be performed. They feel that the building should be confined to such use and should not be employed for the exhibition of the visual arts which are shown in the Government's museums.

The Commission also feels that, instead of the establishment of a Commission such as is proposed in your Bill, the erection and operation of the building should be placed under the direction of the Office of General Services. The Commission hopes that such a building may be erected in the near future and asked me to express its appreciation of the efforts which you and others are making towards this end.

As regards constructing a roof on the Carter Barron Amphitheater in Rock Creek Park, the Commission feels that it is not in a position at this time to express an opinion as to the desirability of constructing a roof on the Carter Barron Amphitheater. They will be glad to consider the matter and to express an opinion if and when a design for such a roof is submitted to the Commission by the National Capital Parks, which has responsibility for operating the amphitheater.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Honorable Charles R. Howell
House of Representatives
Washington D. C.

cc to: Mr. H. T. Osmmerer, Secretary, Commission of Fine Arts.

def/mcK